

**Total Comments:** 495**In Favor:** 7**Opposed:** 432**Undecided:** 56

Filing Support	Commenter	Source	Comments
No			
	Kaj Skov Nielsen	Web	Hi, I have for some years paid for "green power" electricity, as PSE has marketed this at a premium price to ratepayers. If I then have to see additional rate increases to cover the cost of getting rid of coal I am going to pay two times. It seems like all consumers who have paid for green energy for yeas shall not be forced to have yet another rate hike. The hike should be allocated to the people who chose the short term gain of cheap coal that was expected also back than this option had a higher long term cost. I feel addament that we should not use coal, and have been paying nor to use coal for years myself already Regards Kaj Skov Nielsen
	Douglas Thompson	Web	(These comments added by Kathryn McPherson at the request of the consumer, after a complaint inquiry was discussed by phone 3:50 pm 01/24/17)I have been a customer of PSE for over 45 years. My recent statement for December was shocking high at \$434.34. The charge was broken down to a basic charge of \$10, a gas cost charge of \$178, and a delivery charge of \$216. Because the infrastructure and basic personnel are already in place, I think it is outrageous and a "rip-off" to allow PSE to charge a service fee according to amount of gas used. A flat service charge yes, but not an exorbitant one depending amount of gas used. Have talked to several people at PSE and the last one said "Well, the UTC allows it" My question is "Why, in this time of increasing costs and tight money?" (added when on phone - I feel this is a very regressive way to charge for gas service.) Thank you for looking into this matter.
	Rev. William Burk	E-mail	-----Original Message----- From: Rev.William Burk [mailto:revwilliam.burk@gmail.com] Sent: Thursday, April 20, 2017 9:03 AM To: Gomez, David (UTC) <dagomez@utc.wa.gov> Subject: High electric rates are unaffordable and inhumane

Case: 170033

Title: PSE GRC

PI Coordinator: Andrew Roberts

Staff Lead:

## Public Comments by Case

Dear David Gomez UTC,

Billionaire Bill Gates said, global income equalization should be basically accomplished by 2,035 A.D. This means most people will be under the poverty line soon if FREE TRADE continues.

In summary this means suffering and premature deaths for most people are coming. The homeless population is the tip of the iceberg of human suffering.

Nobel Prize Economists have said FREE TRADE is designed to reduce ALL first world economies to basically THIRD WORLD ECONOMIES, with a small first world remnant such as aerospace and electronics surviving in places. In summary, as a result of FREE TRADE crumbling the USA economy, all people and nations will soon be on a "level playing field" as Fmr. Pres. Obama said years ago in Egypt for the coming tyranny of the U.N. World Government, also referred to as the NWO New World Order by Sen. John McCain, Pres. George H. Bush and others.

This planned fall of the economy of the USA makes it imperative to reduce and not raise electric rates. This is extremely important for global security and growing the economy if possible.

National Geographic and others have reported as much as one half of the population of larger species are now gone from the Earth's oceans due to systematic over fishing.

It is HOPELESS to grow and harvest SALMON at the cost of billions of dollars and make people suffer the costs in higher electric rates.

I support hydroelectric power on small rivers such as Olympia's Deschutes River.

A possible temporary solution to help the poor is have a photocopy of the Food Stamp card sent to PSE and the Telephone company to get a lower subsidized rate for those that are truly poor and needy such as the poor, elderly, and disabled.

The phone subsidy of about eight dollars for telephone is ridiculously low as a basic hard line connection for the disabled or elderly hearing impaired costs about twenty five dollars, plus long distance charges.

Please subsidize the electric costs. The five hundred dollars or so given through PSE by the CAC only covers a couple of months or so at health threatening low temperatures in the home of about 53 degrees when the outside temperature is in the twenty's.

The Russians racing to destroy the Earth hard wiring WW3 into all weapons systems should demonstrate to you there will be no future utopia with the coming dark tyranny of the U.N. World Government, but only the growing danger global genocide coming sometime in the next few decades.

Wasting the money and raising electric rates to life threatening levels in support for a soon doomed ecosystem is antiscience, and is highly irrational.

Please double the amounts of the Community Action Council electric rate subsidy for the growing numbers of poor people.

Please consider free 500 Watt Solar Panels installed on a suitable poor person's house roof. I also would think, just as Solar Panels are ALREADY installed on telephone poles to power signs that they may possibly be installed on poor people's telephone pole below the transformer to avoid transformer energy losses to provide solar energy during daylight hours.

The costly idea of installing a feedback power meter system for measuring feedback power into the system is a total waste of money for many people and should be OPTIONAL for those who want to "sell" solar electricity to the power company.

Grace, Blessings and Love Always in God and Jesus Christ,

Rev. William Burk  
14835 Cedarwood DR SE  
Tenino, WA 98589-9675  
website:  
'Jesus is King'  
ChurchState.us  
Phone:

			(360) 264-6307
	Mr. Leffall	Phone	PSE needs to consider that what a person pays during the winter months vs what a person pays during the summer is different because a person uses more heat. PSE needs to change its rates because they are sky high. PSE needs to take winter weather into consideration so people are paying less during the winter. Finally when a customer is offered a budget plan and a customer accepts that plan they are still billing as if the customer is using their heat during the summer. That budget plan needs to be kicked out.
	Lacey	E-mail	Rate increase to generate 68.3 million....what happens to low income who live on fixed income.....how about the CEO taking a serious pay cut.....that would make a dent in that 68.3 million....schools want and need more...cost of living increases....food.....taxes all the other stuff and PS3 got to join in to get more money.....sad!!!!  Sent from my T-Mobile 4G LTE device

**Total Comments:** 495

**In Favor:** 7

**Opposed:** 432

**Undecided:** 56

Filing Support	Commenter	Source	Comments
	Russell White	Phone	<p>Dear WUTC,</p> <p>I am completely and unequivocally opposed to the PSE request for rate adjustments of 3.2% for electric service and URGE the WUTC to deny PSE request.</p> <p>This is an outrageous request!</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The rate of inflation is way below a 3.2% annual rate.</li> <li>2. Wages are NOT increasing at a 3.2% annual rate.</li> <li>3. PSE rationale for rate increase requests are outlandish. Let them look for improved efficiencies rather than expect us, the consumers, to underwrite their additional expenses for depreciation and environmental remediation.</li> </ol> <p>Respectfully submitted,</p> <p>Russell White, PhD 28016 185 PL. S. E. Kent WA 98042</p>

**Total Comments:** 495**In Favor:** 7**Opposed:** 432**Undecided:** 56

Filing Support	Commenter	Source	Comments
	Richie Mathison	E-mail	<p>Staff &amp; Counsel:</p> <p>This comment is regarding the proposed rate changes at PSE. There are foreclosures to consider. I personally have been to properties that have electricity going and are vacant. We have owners living in homes that are in the process of foreclosure. There are also squatters. That being said, these rate changes work like a compounded penalty. They are violent in their absurdity. It is highly outrageous to suggest at rate change at such a time as this. I suggest you work with your suppliers to discuss the reality of deflation.</p> <p>Richie Mathison Realtor</p> <p>360-972-8420</p>

**Total Comments:** 495**In Favor:** 7**Opposed:** 432**Undecided:** 56

Filing Support	Commenter	Source	Comments
	Joe Ackerson	E-mail	<p>To: Washington Utilities and Transportation Commission:</p> <p>I understand the need to occasionally raise rates, however I am opposed to a rate increase in the "basic rate" which is not impacted by use. The reason for my opposition is it disproportionately impacts low use and low income customers. People who work hard to keep use down and conserve energy should receive as much benefit as possible to encourage continuing this behavior. By raising the per kilowatt-hour charge rather than the basic charge, you would incentivize energy conservation. By raising the basic charge, you most negatively impact customers with small households and single- or low-income families. Placing the increase in the use charge rather than the basic charge would give these families have the opportunity to offset the rise in their utility bill with a reduction in usage.</p> <p>Thank-you for taking the time to read my concerns,</p> <p>Joe Ackerson 2626 Hampton Pl Bellingham WA 98225</p>

**Total Comments:** 495

**In Favor:** 7

**Opposed:** 432

**Undecided:** 56

Filing Support	Commenter	Source	Comments
	Daniel Clifford	E-mail	<p>You have got to be kidding; we pay the highest rates in the state by far. This monopoly has got to be illegal.</p> <p>I want to know who pays the utc employee's? Are you public servants? or do you work for PSE? PSE does nothing but collect the money. Potelco (mafia family) does all the in field service at the highest possible union rate.</p> <p>I am serious-I want a response regarding who the UTC represents, and who pays their salary?</p> <p>***SECOND COMMENT FORWARDED BY AGO***</p> <p>PSE customers already pay double the Wa. average rates, and we are supposedly represented by the "Public Counsel Unit" of your office? And ANOTHER rate increase is proposed? I can only assume that those involved are either paid off by PSE, or are miserably incompetent in their positions. I demand as a taxpaying citizen that the obvious corruption in this monopoly be found out, or competent "representatives" be appointed.</p>

**Total Comments:** 495**In Favor:** 7**Opposed:** 432**Undecided:** 56

Filing Support	Commenter	Source	Comments
	John Cohn	E-mail	<p>To Whom it may concern,</p> <p>I am writing in regards to PSE's request to increase power sales rates to residential customers.</p> <p>Being someone that works in the Electrical industry I am opposed to this mainly on the basis that Mid C rates have remained relatively low and sometimes negative for small energy producers having to curtail power for PSE's wind power.</p> <p>I may not have the big picture here, but with mid C averaging around 3.5 cents/kwh there is a lot of profit margin to be made with PSE selling their power for 9.3229 cents for the first 600 kWh and 11.2051 cents for anything after that.</p> <p>Respectfully,</p> <p>Jason Cohn 360-739-9270</p>
	Dale R Petersen	E-mail	<p>The PSE proposal to raise raise electrical rates 3.2% is too high. CPI for all items to May is 1.9%. Rates overall and for residential should not exceed 2.0%.</p> <p>Dale R Petersen Ferndale, WA 360-380-1338</p>

**Total Comments:** 495**In Favor:** 7**Opposed:** 432**Undecided:** 56

Filing Support	Commenter	Source	Comments
	Robert Nedrow III	E-mail	<p>Please do not approve the rate increases, as the rates are high enough already, too high in fact. Between taxes and utilities, you are taxing the citizens of this county and state to death and it's not fair. It's not as if we will receive any kind of increase in service, so why should we have to suffer yet another increase when what we get now is already overpriced. Please do not pass on the poor planning (or lack thereof) of PSE to the citizens who can already ill-afford these current rates, much less an increase in them. PSE should be able to allocate funds or appropriately budget/plan for such things without having to continually raise our rates and pass the buck to us. Make the big corporations who earn all the money pay for once, please, I beg you! In fact, if you want to do anything with the rates, decrease them, as I'm positive that PSE is already making way too much money. Please don't hesitate to contact me if you have any questions.</p> <p>Thank you, Robert Nedrow III</p>
	Mike Mehring	E-mail	<p>This is Mike Mehring I am a customer of PSE living in Redmond. I would like information on the 50 least reliable circuits in PSE's service territory listed as a reason for the rate increase. I did not know that PSE was directly responsible for Coalstrip Montana and the remediation costs. Is PSE a customer, owner and what percent are they responsible for? Finally, I'm unclear how favorable PSE's gas infrastructure is but asking for a rate reduction if they have issues maintaining the infrastructure would be unwise. Do we know what the condition of PSE's gas infrastructure is?</p> <p>Thanks!</p> <p>Michael A Mehring 17137 NE 84th Street Redmond WA 98052</p>

**Total Comments:** 495**In Favor:** 7**Opposed:** 432**Undecided:** 56

Filing Support	Commenter	Source	Comments
	Stephanie Semro	E-mail	<p>To whom it may concern:</p> <p>I am like many other parents in this state, I am a single mother who only makes \$15,000 a year, these rate increases on power kill me. Unlike many parents though, I have an older daughter who works and I have been able to borrow money from cover the power bills. Years ago there was an increase every so often, now the increases are at least a couple times a year. During the winter months I keep my house at 63 degrees, I shower minimally just to save on power and I still can't afford the \$600.00 bill. I only live in a 1000 square foot home and my power bill should not be this much. I know that companies have overhead but really this is ridiculous.</p> <p>I do realize that I can get assistance but to do that in Skagit County, you have to call on a certain date and hope you get an appointment; if you do get an appointment; you have to take a day off work to go to the appointment. That is just not feasible for me. I would just like to be able to pay a reasonable amount for my power and have a stop to these rate increases.</p> <p>This company was a much better company before it became a privately owned company.</p> <p>Best Regards,</p> <p>Stephanie Semro slsemro@yahoo.com</p>

**Total Comments:** 495**In Favor:** 7**Opposed:** 432**Undecided:** 56

Filing Support	Commenter	Source	Comments
	Ron Delismon	E-mail	<p>Public Counsel Unit, WA Office of the Attorney General; Dear Sir:</p> <p>I notice that part of the proposed rate increase by PSE is due to “Increased expenses due to depreciation and cost recovery of ... electric poles, conduits, and transformers.” Depreciation is not an actual expense, but an accounting method used to estimate current asset value. It may or may not represent possible future replacement costs. Actual Maintenance expense experience forecasts (based on history) are the amounts that should be used here (because depreciation amounts are usually inflated).</p> <p>That’s my comment, thank you for your time and consideration. Best Regards, Ron Delismon</p>
	Deborah Dolman	E-mail	<p>The following comments are related to the above proposed electric rate. I would ask that the proposed rate NOT be approved. Utilities should not be increased as it is a basic necessity like food and water. People cannot continue to pay for increases in utility rates, taxes and the like when their income does not increase. I retired last year and have a fixed income which does not allow for increases in utilities, taxes, etc. It seems that our "leaders" just want us to all be on the streets without a home or lodging.</p> <p>Any increase should not be passed to the elderly, retirees, or those with low incomes. Thank you for your consideration. Sincerely, Deborah Dolman-Washington resident</p>

**Total Comments:** 495**In Favor:** 7**Opposed:** 432**Undecided:** 56

Filing Support	Commenter	Source	Comments
	Marci Spear	E-mail	<p>Dear Attorney General and the Utility Commission; PLEASE do not approve the increase that PSE is requesting. You have, Utility Commission approved all their requests over the past few years &amp; this has got to stop. My home is (newly recalculated) charge is now \$300 per month 'budget plan' as it is. I do not have the money to afford a new electric furnace &amp; the electrical expense is already almost 20% of my income. I have benefited from the LIHEAP program except for this past year &amp; I don't know how I managed without it. This is bad for those of us that are lower income, elderly &amp; struggling to stay in our homes with heat. All for the purpose of raising their income? Their depreciation, their investors? We had a power pole knocked down by a driver a few years ago &amp; they put in a new pole strapped against the old one - never did fix / remove the broken one. Is this what they call maintenance? I often wonder about the gas main piping that is only 50' from my living room and was installed to service the Orting housing expansion in the 1990's. They should have to show more need for any more increases to be considered. Living in the Pacific NW with our hydroelectric /wind farm generated electricity should be a benefit to those living here, not a consideration for generating sales to other areas. I could go on, but I believe I have made my basic point.</p> <p>Sincerely &amp; Respectfully, Marci Spear Puyallup, WA</p>

**Total Comments:** 495

**In Favor:** 7

**Opposed:** 432

**Undecided:** 56

Filing Support	Commenter	Source	Comments
	Debbie R Moreno	E-mail	<p>This will probably fall on deaf ears but I strongly oppose this rate hike for the simple reason we just got a rate hike. PSE send out these notices on saving energy so we do then they want to raise our rates because they need more revenue.</p> <p>Thanks for the consideration</p> <p>Debbie R Moreno 6511 190th Trl SW Rochester, WA 98579</p>
	Greg and Mary Blazek	E-mail	<p>I would ask the UTC analyze this request carefully. Based on overall wholesale energy rates electricity rates should be decreasing yet PSE is asking for an increase. They need to do better job of controlling their own costs. The Montana coal plant is a red herring excuse. Also, based on wholesale rates the gas rates should be going lower than PSE has proposed. Consumers need to see more of the savings from reduced energy costs. Please consider the consumer when evaluating this PSE proposal.</p> <p>Greg and Mary Blazek</p> <p>Sent from XFINITY Connect Mobile App</p>

**Total Comments:** 495**In Favor:** 7**Opposed:** 432**Undecided:** 56

Filing Support	Commenter	Source	Comments
	Michele Whittington	E-mail	To UTC,  I do not give my consent regarding Puget Sound Energy's rate increase request.  Sincerely,  Michele Whittington Woodinville resident
	Linda Setchfiled	Mail	***SEE ATTACHED CUSTOMER LETTER***

**Total Comments:** 495**In Favor:** 7**Opposed:** 432**Undecided:** 56

Filing Support	Commenter	Source	Comments
	Gary S Simpson	E-mail	<p>Puget Sound Energy Customer Care PO Box 97034 Bellevue WA 98009-9734</p> <p>One of the reasons PSE provides for an overall 3.2 percent increase in electric service rates is the expenses related to the partial shutdown of the Montana Colstrip Generating Station. Yet, PSE has recently announced seeking electric power from a similar source in Montana.</p> <p>The policy to continue reliance on fossil fuels such as from strip mining coal in the Powder River Basin will continue the problems of climate change and the environmental remediation expenses cited as a reason for the proposed electric service rate increase. Such a decision will continue burdens on not only current ratepayers such as our household, but also on those such as our 24-year-old son for his likely lifetime. PSE can do better for its customers by increasing use of electric power from renewable energy sources.</p> <p>Sincerely,</p> <p>Gary S Simpson 16420 SE 31st Street Bellevue WA 98008-5715 PSE Account Number 200020965147</p>
	Jarmo Paukkunen	Phone	<p>Hello,</p> <p>PSE is proposing a hike of 3.2% on electricity prices, and cutting gas prices by a similar amount. Our home does not have a gas connection, and while having the gas connected is desirable, the</p>

high cost of appliance replacement makes this economically infeasible.

I oppose the PSE electricity price increase on the following grounds:

1. PSE claims 'increased depreciation expenses'. These are non-cash accounting charges that impact profitability, not costs per se. How PSE chooses to do cost accounting should not impact my bill.
2. PSE's justification includes remediation of the Montana Colstrip Generating Station in July 2022, for which it wants to start charging now ... why?
3. PSE's justification includes environmental compliance with WA state regulations, which are "expected to result in higher power costs". Why not change prices when those costs are known, rather than "expected".
4. PSE is a monopoly in our area so has little incentive to control prices.
5. PSE's increase of electricity prices seems to be more about making up lower revenues due to falling natural gas prices that PSE had to pass on to its customers. So it is disingenuous at best. Gas price reference <https://www.eia.gov/dnav/ng/hist/rngwhhdm.htm>
6. PSE's majority owner, ultimately Macquarie Bank in Australia, is well versed in maximizing profits from infrastructure investments. Overbuilding transmission networks is a common ploy used by transmission companies in Australia, where the average household's electric bill is now 50% to compensate transmission companies for unnecessary capacity (also known as 'gold plating'). This triggered a parliamentary inquiry that resulted in many capital projects being deferred or canceled outright ([http://www.apf.gov.au/~link.aspx?\\_id=D3162996DBB04099B6835FD018B4CE16&\\_z=z](http://www.apf.gov.au/~link.aspx?_id=D3162996DBB04099B6835FD018B4CE16&_z=z)).
7. Electric power suppliers' estimates for future demand are notoriously unreliable in WA State. According to the WA State Dept. of Commerce, all prior estimates were incorrect, overestimating demand by 10%. Power use per capita is falling, not rising. See <http://www.commerce.wa.gov/wp-content/uploads/2016/06/Commerce-Electric-Utility-Resource-Planning-2014.pdf> for specifics. So additional costs for network upgrades are not defensible.

All in all this is just a grab for more profits by a greedy monopoly.

Regards,

			<p>Jarmo Paukkunen  BBA (Comp. Sci. &amp; Accounting), Master of Information Systems  Senior Member, Institute of Electrical and Electronics Engineers (IEEE)  Mobile: (425) 281-4959  Email: jarmo@paukkunen.net</p>
	<p>Conrad &amp; Ingrid  Brownlee</p>	<p>E-mail</p>	<p>***This comment was sent to PSE, with UTC Public Involvement and Public Counsel utility copied***</p> <p>We are concerned with the PSE electric service rate changes proposed for December 2017 (we are not a natural gas service customer).</p> <p>We received a rate increase on May 1, 2016 from \$.095539 to \$.097543 - a 2.1% increase.</p> <p>Then we received another rate increase on May 1, 2017 from \$.097543 to \$.100413 - a 2.94% increase.</p> <p>Now you are requesting a further rate increase to be effective sometime after December 2017. It is requesting a rate increase from \$.093229 to \$.094292 - a 1.14% increase.</p> <p>We trust the UTC is in a position to fairly evaluate the reasons for your requested rate adjustments, but as a general comment we are getting tired of hearing about environmental, clean air and emission reduction requirements and the ever-increasing emphasis on green power driving up our power costs. We do not want to subsidize those who wish to install solar panels, who would never install them if they had to pay the true economic cost themselves, just to support an industry that cannot thrive on its own without "charitable" contributions from ratepayers.</p> <p>Also we strongly disagree with PSE's desire to start collecting funds for a proposed closure of a coal-fired electrical generation plant in Montana, which may not even happen, but if it does happen, would not occur for at least another 5 years.</p> <p>What is the need and justification for increasing the basic charge from \$7.87 to \$9.00 per month - a 14.36% increase?</p>

			<p>Respectfully,</p> <p>Conrad &amp; Ingrid Brownlee</p> <p>---</p> <p>This email has been checked for viruses by Avast antivirus software.  <a href="https://www.avast.com/antivirus">https://www.avast.com/antivirus</a></p>
	Andy Rivas	E-mail	<p>To Whom It May Concern,</p> <p>I'm writing to comment regarding PSE proposed rate changes. I've read over the reasons for the rate adjustments. Even though there is a net decrease in terms of combined percent change between electric and natural gas service, I see no reason that PSE cannot find other ways to pay for the cost of running their business.</p> <p>The reasons given for adjustments should be considered their cost of doing business, and not a cost to absorbed by their customers. PSE revenue of 3.23 billion dollars ought to be able to cover this cost. The leadership teams combined salary is close to 9 million dollars. Between all of their resourceful minds, they should work to find other ways to run their business and while efficiently providing electricity and gas to customers.</p> <p>Thanks</p> <p>Andy Rivas  2414 159th Ave SE  Bellevue, WA 98008</p>

**Total Comments:** 495**In Favor:** 7**Opposed:** 432**Undecided:** 56

Filing Support	Commenter	Source	Comments
	Rayna Holtz	Mail	<p>***See attached postcard with customer comment, no return address***</p> <p>To the WUTC Commissioner</p> <p>RE: Puget Sound Energy Rate Case Hearing on August 31.</p> <p>Please insist that PSE shut down the coal plant ASAP. 2025 is too long to wait. I also doubt the wisdom of their building a new fossil fuel plant in the form of the LNG plant in Tacoma. Will you please offer encouragement (incentives?) to PSE to move to clean energy sources instead?</p> <p>Thank you Rayna Holtz Vashon, WA</p> <p>UPDATE September 1, 2017 - 1:13 p.m. The consumer filed additional comments.</p> <p>SEE ATTACHED ADDITIONAL COMMENTS FILED BY THE CONSUMER.</p>
	John Dinniene	Mail	***See attached customer letter***
	Eric Newgard	E-mail	<p>Please approve the recommended 3.2% or more decrease in Natural Gas Service rates from Puget Sound Energy.</p> <p>Sincerely, Eric Newgard</p>

**Total Comments:** 495**In Favor:** 7**Opposed:** 432**Undecided:** 56

Filing Support	Commenter	Source	Comments
	Hanna Miles	E-mail	<p>Good morning,</p> <p>I have received notice from PSE that they are requesting a rate increase for electric service. I am requesting that the Utilities and Transportation Commission decline this request. I have not received an increase of cost of living of over 2% since 2009. I can barely afford my bills as they currently stand. I have utilized as many energy saving appliances as possible and try to wash my laundry in non-peak hours. Please give PSE customers a break and decline PSE's continuing and constant rate increases.</p> <p>I also think when PSE sends notice to customers about their ability to comment on a rate increase, they should send it as a separate mailing and not include it with the bill which commonly has other non-essential paperwork included and is easier for customers to overlook.</p> <p>Thank you for your time and consideration.</p> <p>Sincerely,</p> <p>Hanna Miles 8635 173rd Avenue SW Rochester, WA 98579 (360) 791-0535 hannamiles@yahoo.com</p>

**Total Comments:** 495**In Favor:** 7**Opposed:** 432**Undecided:** 56

Filing Support	Commenter	Source	Comments
	Ted and Terri Jansen	E-mail	My thoughts on the PSE rate increase request for electricity is that there is no reason for such a request. The cost of energy in all sectors has decreased. The cost of the fuels used to generate electricity are down, particularly natural gas. This is illustrated by the PSE request to lower gas rates. As for the cost of transmission, PSE should bring the power closer to the customers with the use of solar and wind power near their substations, where additional low cost power can be added to the system. The net result of an increase for PSE is going to be fewer customers, as more switch to their own solar or wind power, with storage in new battery technology, and drop from the PSE grid. This will become a downward spiral for PSE over time, with fewer customers as their rates go up to maintain a smaller system. Their request is very short sighted and only geared to increase their short term profits.
	Ellen Schug	Mail	***SEE ATTACHED LETTER***
	Melvin D. Readnour	Mail	***SEE ATTACHED LETTER FOR CUSTOMER COMMENT***

**Total Comments:** 495

**In Favor:** 7

**Opposed:** 432

**Undecided:** 56

Filing Support	Commenter	Source	Comments
	Mark Jarmuth	E-mail	<p>i strongly urge WUTC to reject PSE's request for an increase in electric and natural gas rates.</p> <p>To begin with, we have experienced no inflation over the last twelve months. If anything, goods and services are less expensive now than in summer 2016. PSE has itself benefited from the deflation and as a result should be offering customers a rate decrease, not an increase.</p> <p>PSE's argument about depreciated assets is specious. It's assets have depreciated in value largely because more effective ways for energy companies to do business are rapidly emerging due to technological innovation. This process has been underway for at least two decades and should have already reduced PSE's cost of doing business, although it did not mention this as it attempted to justify a rates increase.</p> <p>In reality, the only reason PSE has asked for the increase it because it is a monopoly and does not have to worry about competition - and being a monopoly is no justification for requesting the increase. In light of this and the other factors mentioned above, should WUTC grant PSE's request the move would smack of collusion and reflect poorly on both entities. For this and the other reasons mention, I again would encourage the WUTC to reject PSE's request.</p> <p>Sincerely, Mark Jarmuth jarmuth@hotmail.com</p>

**Total Comments:** 495

**In Favor:** 7

**Opposed:** 432

**Undecided:** 56

Filing Support	Commenter	Source	Comments
	Stephen and Susan Bennett	E-mail	<p>Seems like the more we reduce electric usage, the more PSE charges per kWh. PSE should have stopped using coal a long time ago because of its effects on the atmosphere. Costs of decommissioning Colstrip should be absorbed by the corporation under "fines and penalties".</p> <p>Depreciation of capital assets is not an appropriate expense for raising rates. It is an annual expense on the books, and they don't ask for a rate increase annually because of it. Please stop these constant unwarranted rate increases.</p> <p>Thank you for your attention.            Stephen and Susan Bennett            2191 Goss Ridge Road, Freeland</p>

**Total Comments:** 495**In Favor:** 7**Opposed:** 432**Undecided:** 56

Filing Support	Commenter	Source	Comments
	Tim Kraus	E-mail	<p>I am opposed to the rate increase being proposed for Puget Sound Energy.</p> <p>It is my belief that rates for electric rates in our area are very high given the plentiful availability of power resources in our area.</p> <p>34% of the electricity which is sold by PSE is Hydroelectric energy. PSE is currently in the process of accelerating depreciation of coal-powered electric generation facilities in Montana, presumably due to the Microsoft agreement which provides \$23.7 M to PSE for Microsoft to opt out of PSE's generation of power from non-renewable sources.</p> <p>Washington State produces an enormous amount of power from hydroelectric generating facilities. Other utilities in Washington State fulfill their obligations with their excess revenue. Because PSE is a privately held firm, their attempts to enhance their profits is difficult to understand when other publically held utilities are posting excesses in revenues.</p> <p>I strongly urge the UTC to deny the request by PSE to increase residential rates.</p> <p>Very truly yours, Tim Kraus</p>
	Derek Sherrod	E-mail	<p>Regarding PSE's upcoming rate increase proposal.</p> <p>Put simply, there is profitable and tgere is GREEDY, with this upcoming multi pronged proposal the propose increasing the "monthly surcharge" (for the privelege of having PSE's glorious service) and also increasing the electric fee itself putting another 68 Million into their Greedy Pockets.....when is enough enough?</p> <p>Derek Sherrod</p> <p>P.S. When Are You Going To Have A Public Meeting In Bremerton Or Port Orchard?</p>

Russell Borgmann E-mail

\*\*\*SEE Russell Borgman email for sources\*\*\*

From: Russell Borgmann <rborgmann@hotmail.com>  
Sent: Monday, July 31, 2017 2:24 PM  
To: Steven Johnson  
Cc: rborgmann  
Subject: WUTC Public Comments in Bellevue, 6pm 7/31/17, Docket UE-160918

Comments to the WUTC Regarding Docket No. UE-160918

Mr. Johnson  
Senior Commission Policy Advisor, WUTC

The Honorable Mr. Johnson,

The question before the WUTC is approval of another rate increase on behalf of PSE. PSE says they need to increase rates – again. However the WUTC has recently recommended that PSE should LOWER its rates.[i] Is PSE’s recent request to increase rates – AGAIN – another ploy to plump up profits of an investor owned utility, when foreign investors (Macquarie) are seeking to sell their 42% stake in PSE?[ii]

Commissioners of the WUTC, we ask that you protect ratepayers against an investor owned utility that does not appear to have its customer’s best interests at heart. PSE says that they must increase costs. Yet, their 10Q financial filings, in the face of robust economic growth and population growth, show that electricity demand is flat to DECLINING. PSE’s own 10Q financial filings state that conclusion: “PSE also expects energy usage by both residential electric and natural gas customers to continue a long-term trend of slow decline primarily due to continued energy efficiency improvements.”[iii] This has been the trend year-over-year for many years now.

We collectively are using less electricity via more efficient building techniques and materials, energy efficient appliances, conservation, and local micro generation. Bonneville Power Administration has already accepted the impact of these changes, and decided to CANCEL its I-5 Reinforcement Project.[iv] BPA stated that evolving energy markets and technology, like batteries, played a major role in the decision to cancel that project.

It’s time for PSE to re-evaluate its business model. This is a NOT a question of growing the business, as Macquarie, PSE’s owners, has claimed.[v] This is a question of PSE learning how to manage and control its OPERATING costs. It’s time for PSE to learn how to operate more

			<p>efficiently. (Example: PSE’s CEO earns TEN TIMES more than Seattle City Light’s CEO. Kimberly Harris’ salary is more than \$3 Million annually vs. Larry Weis’ \$340,000 annual salary). Please protect PSE ratepayers. Please do NOT approve another rate increase. Send a message to PSE that they need to learn how to operate more efficiently in the headwinds of an evolving energy landscape that finds decentralized electricity generation as the new norm of the future. Seek ways to encourage PSE to embrace a new business model that promotes ADDING renewable energy resources to the grid, while retiring dirty, polluting coal generating resources, like Colstrip. Seek ways to encourage and promote the use of battery technologies that smooth peak load demands. Southern California, New York, Hawaii, Australia, the UK, and many other regions have found a way to make that happen.[vi]</p> <p>In Washington, a region that touts world-class technology and entrepreneurialism as well as a profound love of the environment, we should – and must – LEAD the nation in promoting safer, more reliable, environmentally friendly, sustainable energy resources that are fairly priced. Raising rates for an investor owned utility that owns one of the worst polluting plants west of the Mississippi is a step the wrong direction. Send a clear message to PSE that they must operate more efficiently while seeking ways to provide reliable, environmentally friendly sources of electricity. Please protect ratepayers.</p> <p>Thank you.                  Russell Borgmann                  2100 120th Place                  Bellevue WA 98005</p>
	Randal Samstag	E-mail	<p>***Customer also attended the 7-31-17 Public Comment Hearing and provided comment***</p> <p>I intend to offer oral comment at the hearing today in Bellevue, but include written comment below and by pdf attachment.</p> <p>My name is Randal W. Samstag and I live on Bainbridge Island in Kitsap County. I wish to address the question of allocation of costs for cleanup of the Colstrip, Montana generating station ash ponds between shareholders and ratepayers. I am a registered civil and sanitary engineer in Washington State who has designed both earthen basins to infiltrate treated wastewater into the groundwater system and waste containment basins designed to ensure that contaminated waste does not reach groundwater. I have been a PSE customer in Kitsap County since 1977.</p> <p>I have reviewed several reports describing the process water system at the Colstrip power station,</p>

including a 1986 report prepared by the Montana Power Company Thermal Generation Engineering Department reviewing alternatives for management of ash from the Colstrip Generating Units Numbers 1 and 2 and the 2012 Plant Site Report prepared by Hydrometrics, Inc. for PPL Montana (PPLM) as required by the Montana Department of Environmental Quality (MDEQ) Administrative Order On Consent (AOC).

What these reports make clear is that most of this extensive pond system (nearly 150 acres of water surface) was originally constructed with a clay lining that has permitted significant seepage over the years since these ponds were first constructed in 1975. While the PPLM report makes continuous mention of the “closed loop” nature of this pond system, it seems that from 1975 through 2004 to 2006 much of this extensive pond system had only a clay liner and no leachate recovery. That is approximately 30 years of pollution from these ponds to the adjacent groundwater system with total dissolved solids concentrations as high as 30,000 mg/L and sulfate concentrations as high as 21,000 mg/L.

It is clear from the 1986 report that at least since then, the owners of the facility had the option of an alternative to this polluting pond system for processing of liquid residuals from the power station: a dry process using mechanical dewatering equipment with supernatant treatment. The owners chose not to install this kind of system that would have prevented seepage of thousands of gallons of leachate to adjacent ground water. It is only since the 2016 Settlement Agreement of the lawsuit filed by the Sierra Club and the World Wildlife Federation that the owners have finally committed to dry ash storage in the Units 3 and 4 Effluent Holding Ponds (EHPs) and that commitment will be implemented only by 2022.

As a Puget Power and PSE ratepayer for 40 years I welcome paying for measures to eliminate pollution from generation of the power I use, both in disposal of liquid wastes from its generation plants and in carbon pollution from its fossil fuel generation plants. My family pays an extra cent per kilowatt hour tariff for “green power” from PSE to prevent atmospheric and groundwater pollution. But I think it is inappropriate for ratepayers to bear any of the burdens for cleaning up pollution from these plants that was clearly preventable and the result of decisions made by the owners alone. This seems to be the case for the pollution from the ash ponds for the Colstrip generating station. The company didn’t ask me whether to use a less expensive and more uncertain method to handle liquid residuals from their power station. Now that their ash ponds have polluted groundwater for at least 30 years, it should be the sole responsibility of the shareholders to pay for

			<p>remediation of the damage that these decisions have caused.</p> <p>--</p> <p>Randal W. Samstag  Civil and Sanitary Engineer  Email: rsamstag@rsamstag.com  Web: http://rsamstag.com/  Phone:+1 (206) 851-0094  PO Box 10129  Bainbridge Island, WA 98110 US</p>
	Jeff Thiel	E-mail	<p>***Customer also commented at the 7-31-17 Public Comment Hearing***</p> <p>I would like to submit the following testimony related to Docket 170033:</p> <p>My name is Jeff Thiel. I am a PSE customer.</p> <p>In my career, I have worked as a business strategy consultant for Bain &amp; Co., a software executive for Microsoft, and as an entrepreneur bringing new products and services to market in multiple industries.</p> <p>Recently I had the opportunity to participate in a Fellowship program, where I researched how to accelerate the United States transition to a Clean Energy economy.</p> <p>My research showed that we have the tools today to move off fossil fuels. Energy Efficiency is the lowest cost, lowest risk resource – and we have a lot of it. Renewable energy is competitive with natural gas, cheaper than coal, and far superior to both if we consider even a fraction of the cost and risk of fossil fuel pollution. And there are many examples around the world of energy utilities that are successfully moving off fossil fuels by innovating and implementing proven new technologies.</p> <p>That’s the good news. The bad news is that we’re not moving fast enough to avoid a climate catastrophe. This rate filing is a case in point. It is perpetuating the very risky status quo, when we need to be moving away from the status quo toward clean energy solutions. It’s part of a</p>

			<p>pattern that I see in Puget Sound Energy’s regulatory filings. The PSE 2015 IRP calls for making major new investments in fossil fuel generation capacity, continuing to emit the same amount of Carbon Dioxide pollution for the next 20 years. And here in Bellevue PSE is promoting a plan which will saddle ratepayers with hundreds of millions of dollars in future costs to pay for obsolete infrastructure that could be avoided by implementing Distributed Energy Resources and Demand Response programs.</p> <p>I would gladly pay a higher price for electricity if I knew the increase would help future generations to inherit a healthy, livable planet. But this rate case does nothing to address the threat of climate change. Therefore, it should not be approved.</p> <p>Instead, I ask that PSE and the UTC demonstrate leadership toward moving Washington State to a clean energy future. We ratepayers need our regulators to promote regulatory frameworks that reward utilities for moving our state toward a clean grid. And we need our utilities to propose new solutions rather than reverting to old approaches. The costs of moving to clean energy *now* are significant but manageable. The costs of not moving now may be infinite.</p> <p>Thank you for the opportunity to speak today.</p>
	Amy Myers	E-mail	<p>Good Morning,          I just learned that we will be having a 2.6% rate increase in our Puget Sound Energy bill. I live out in the county where we are not offered natural gas.          Our propane bills are already high and with the Puget Sound Energy bill going up another 2.6% it definitely makes it difficult for our family to make ends meet.</p> <p>Please take into consideration those home owners who don't get the -4.2% reduction in natural gas rates when increasing the PSE rates.</p> <p>Amy Myers          Coldwell Banker Bain - Broker          360-739-2424          www.myershometeam.com          amymyers@cbbain.com</p>
	Patty Hill	E-mail	<p>Hello,</p>

I have no idea what you're looking for in these emails when we're opposed to a rate increase by one of the utility companies, but I would just like to express my concern over what Puget Sound Energy is asking for again. It seems like they go from wanting an increase in natural gas one year and then flip flop and the next year it's the electric customers that have to pay. When none of the wages for normal average working customers is increasing, yet everything else around us is going up and I'm just tired of it. There never seems to be a way to stop it. Yes, I realize we can not use electricity, but that would be kind of dumb since our house is all electric. We're in an area that does not offer natural gas and no one seems to want to come to our area to do that.

Why are we being penalized for what's going on at Montana Colstrip Generating Station and if their poles, conduits and transformers are depreciating, why should we as the public have to pay for this too? Why increased expenses for a "proposed reliability program", doesn't proposed mean something in the works and unless they actually bring it to fruition, why should we pay more?

I just don't understand why we have to continue to get charged higher rates on our power bills when they seem high already. I realize nothing I say will probably put a dent in the public hearings, but it would be nice if somebody sooner or later stood up and said we aren't going to allow this again.

Thank you.

Patty Hill

\*\*\*Second comment received 9/8/17, 1:45 pm via web form\*\*\*

It seems like they go from wanting an increase in natural gas one year, then next year it's the electric customers (of which I am one) that have to pay more. When none of the wages for normal average working customers is increasing, it's not right that all of our utilities keep going up and I'm tired of it. I realize we can use less electricity, but our whole house is electric and we're in an area that does not offer natural gas and no one wants to put into our neighborhood. Why are we being penalized for what's going on at Montana Colstrip Generating Station and if their poles, conduits and transformers are depreciating, why should we as the public have to pay for this too? Why increased expenses for a "proposed reliability program", doesn't proposed mean something in the

			works and unless they actually bring it to fruition, why should we pay more? I just don't understand why we have to continue to get charged higher rates on our power bills when they seem high already. Would be nice to have someone stand up for us and say enough is enough.
	Bob Dehon	E-mail	As a PSE customer, I want to go on record, strongly apposing any rate increase.  Thank You
	Gwen Hunter	E-mail	In this era of rising costs & stagnant wages how the heck are we supposed to cook and stay warm? I live where there's no natural gas and my heat is wood, propane and/or electricity depending on which room is being used. My home is an excellent candidate for solar but only rich people are able to afford it. (Same is true for energy efficient cars.)  I was born in Bellingham but poor energy choices (fossil fuels, nukes) have created horrible environmental conditions that are forcing those who can to leave their states & many are moving here. They are richer than native Bellinghamsters and many of us are becoming poorer because of the increased cost of living in our hometown.  Please do not add to this pressure!  Gwen Hunter 2540 Applejack Ln Bellingham, WA 98226
	Haley Herr	E-mail	Dear Commissioners David Danner, Ann Rendahl and Jay Balabas of the UTC;  My name is Haley Herr and I am the Energy Assistance Program Manager of Centerstone, a Community Action Program serving Seattle City residents for the last 53 years. Centerstone provides energy assistance to low income Puget Sound Energy customers through the LIHEAP and PSE HELP programs. We are here to bring awareness to the adverse impact of the proposed rate and basic charge increases related to docket number 170033, as well as advocate for changes and further investment in energy assistance programs that will make them more equitable for low income customers. The increase in the basic monthly charge and increased rates for PSE electric customers, will only further the economic hardship of low income families. Increasing rates will result in a \$20 increase per year per family, of whom are already struggle to pay for all their basic needs. To offset the impact of this, we propose increasing PSE HELP funding by 5%, double the

rate increase.

We would also like to speak in support of other changes that will improve access to energy assistance programming and ultimately reduce the energy burden currently experienced by low income customers. We would like to speak in support of the following:

- Allow a 2 year certification process where our most vulnerable customers – older adults, people with disabilities and those with fixed income - would only have to go through the process of applying every 2 years. This would significantly reduce the burden of the applying.
- Create an income guideline of 150% FPL for all CAP agencies across the state, and removing the AMI guidelines for some areas. This will remove any added complexities in applying for services and make the program available to more low income customers in some areas.
- Work with PSE to develop an online application where customers can apply from home. This has the benefits of cost savings to administer the program, reduces the burden for clients and would more effectively serve our clients who are homebound or have transportation barriers in getting to our office.
- Provide alternative program offerings and other benefit structures, including an arrearage management plan for customers to help those with a high energy burden where our assistance programs are not enough.
- Provide more administrative support for CAP agencies to make program improvements and outreach to better serve the most vulnerable who face barriers in accessing our programs.
- Develop a PSE HELP advisory committee, that is comprised of representatives from CAP agencies and customers who can weigh in on decisions and programming.

We hope that you will seriously consider and adopt our proposals. Puget Sound Energy has the ability to make decisions that can make programs more accessible and create rate structures that are fair for low income customers. We urge you to keep our customers in mind as you move forward. Thank you for your time.

Best Regards,

Haley Herr  
Energy Assistance Program Manager

Case: 170033

Title: PSE GRC

PI Coordinator: Andrew Roberts

Staff Lead:

		<p>Centerstone of Seattle 722 18th Ave   Seattle, WA 98122 (d) 206.812.4945   (p) 206.812.4940 haley@center-stone.org www.center-stone.org</p>
--	--	--

Filing Support	Commenter	Source	Comments
	Mark B Bailey	E-mail	<p>I realize that all companies need to make a reasonable profit but when it comes to electricity which is almost impossible to live without steps need to be taken to direct the providers to providing low environmental impact electricity in a competitive environment.</p> <p>Specifically with the latest PSE request it is unreasonable to have the basic charge continue to increase without competition be offered for the actual cost of electricity. The basic charge should be designed to cover the cost of delivering electricity, and the electric rates should be designed to encourage conservation especially during periods of high use. A system should be implemented that includes the ability to contract for electricity from one of several organizations, rates should be required to reflect use during high demand (time of day, etc.), and a basic charge set (with minimal profit) for delivery from the local company that has a monopoly on the distribution system.</p> <p>PSE should also have to absorb the cost of closing down a high polluting electric plant without raising rates. PSE made a poor choice to rely on such a dirty source of power production for such a long time and not plan better for the plants obsolescence in a competitive market.</p> <p>Until PSE provides a method for the consumer to select power in a competitive market all rate increases should be denied. Power generated from coal should be eliminated in the State of Washington and until it is eliminated all coal produced power should be regulated to be provided at cost with no profit or cost contribution to the salary of the top 5% (as determined by salary) of PSE employees.</p> <p>The State of Washington needs to get aggressive to eliminate coal produced power and provide a competitive power supply environment.</p> <p>Respectfully submitted,</p> <p>Mark Bailey 23022 130th PL SE Kent, WA 98031</p>

**Total Comments:** 495**In Favor:** 7**Opposed:** 432**Undecided:** 56

Filing Support	Commenter	Source	Comments
	Richard Johnson	E-mail	<p>This comment is about the PSE electric rate case. I believe the docket number is 170033</p> <p>This comment addresses overall rate design.</p> <p>The PSE customers enrolled in the Green Power are paying a premium for their electricity explicitly because they do not want power from dirty plants like Colstrip. PSE has legitimate expenses for dealing with Colstrip, but it is wrong to require the Green Power payers to bear them.</p> <p>As a practical matter, the financial impact is not large. I believe that only 4% of PSE customers are enrolled and they use only 1% of PSE sales. However, as a matter of fairness and transparency it is important to allocate these costs to the appropriate customer group.</p> <p>Richard Johnson</p>
	Art Vertner	E-mail	<p>This message is sent to object to a portion of PSE proposed 2017 electrical and natural gas rate increases.</p> <p>My name is Art Vertner. I have worked in the energy efficiency business my entire career, which now spans over 30 years. The rate increase notice I received in my recent billing from PSE seems to be quite reasonable (only 2.5% for electricity), until one looks closer their proposal. For purposes of my observations I will focus on the electrical side of PSE, but the same is true of natural gas.</p> <p>While their "flyer" points to a 2.5% increase in their sample billing, it conveniently does not show the percentage of increase in the "Basic Charge." A quick calculation shows this to be a 14.3% increase. While the dollar amount is small (I suspect most would not object to a \$1.13 per month increase), the shift in HOW the utility funds its operations is of fundamental concern. Currently PSE customers pay a nominal charge to "connect" and then pay for the power they use. The new</p>

proposed rate structure starts a change that gives PSE a secure income stream no matter how much the customer base actually uses. Given a few more years of 14%+ increases, the Basic Charge will grow to be a significant number in every household's billing.

The increase in the basic charge is of concern on two levels:

First: This increase directly affects low to moderate income people disproportionately. People of modest means pay a significantly higher percentage of their income for electricity than does more affluent customers of PSE. These low to moderate income people work hard, in my experience, to minimize their usage and thereby keep their utility costs low. To increase their rate by over 14% (assuming they use less than the minimum provided) is patently unfair.

Secondly: This increase is equivalent to "death by a thousand cuts" to the efficiency efforts of PSE customers. Efficiency improvements are often implemented based upon some sort of financial analysis. If the "Basic Charge" represents the lowest costs a customer can achieve, then any improvement beyond that threshold is suspect. Simply put, why be more efficient if the customer can't see a payback? The Northwest, and especially in PSE service territory, have done exceptionally well in implementing efficiency measures in their businesses and homes. Having said that, there is still much that can be done and this portion of the rate increase is not supportive of continued efforts. Here is an example of this concept in action: My partner recently purchased a condo in the City of Everett. It's a modest place, and she is thoughtful about the water she uses. Imagine her surprise to learn her water/sewer bill is very close to \$100/month. When she called the utility, she was informed that even though she uses less than 10% of the amount of water included in her "basic charge," her bill fixed. She learned that she can use 20 times the water and not pay more. What incentive to be efficient is that?

Recommendation:

I would recommend the UTC reject the increase of the Basic Charge for both Residential and Commercial customers. In fact, I would recommend those charges be lowered to support those families with moderate incomes. Take the increase that PSE justifies, and increase the cost per kWh. This rate structure is FAIR. Those who use more, pay more. And finally, this rate structure is SUPPORTIVE OF EFFICIENCY IMPROVEMENTS.

			<p>One final comment: I find PSE "flyer" disingenuous to the point of being deceptive. By not making clear the over 14% increase in the basic charge, most people will overlook it. And that clearly is PSE's intent. I recommend the UTC call them on it.</p> <p>Arthur L Vertner 206.659.3890 art.vertner@outlook.com</p>
	Andrea Avni	Mail	*** See attached Letter for customer comment***
	Unknown 1	Mail	<p>***See attached letter for customer comment, from 7-31-17 public comment hearing***</p> <p>Dear Ms. Harris,</p> <p>I was very excited to hear about your new position as CEO of PSE. As a women's rights activist, I'm thrilled to see a fellow woman in a position of leadership, with the capacity to make a positive change in the world.</p> <p>I'm writing you because I recently read PSE is the third biggest contributor to pollution...in the entire nation. As a resident of King County, and a mother of 3, I was appalled by this fact.</p> <p>While I do appreciate yar efforts to reach 15% renewable energy, I'm afraid this will not be enough particularly, because it won't go into effect until 2020. We need drastic change NOW.</p> <p>I urge you...no. I beg you, to stop polluting the air we breath. I beg you to not destroy the land our children and future generations will inhabit.</p> <p>I know you will be a leader for positive change. I know you will succeed where many men in power before you have failed.</p> <p>Thank you for your time.</p>

Filing Support	Commenter	Source	Comments
	Diana Beas	Mail	<p>*** See attached letter for customer comment***  *** 7/31 Public Comment Hearing***</p> <p>June 28, 2017  Dear Puget Sound Energy CEO Kimberly Harris,</p> <p>My name is Diana Beas. I'm a person who loves mother nature and all the beauty it gives us. As such, I want to thank you for committing to retiring 2 of the dirtiest boilers at the coalstrip coal plant. Further, I am writing this letter to you to retire the other 2 coal no later than 2025.</p> <p>The reasons:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) The coalstrip coal plant is the 8th largest polluting plant in America.</li> <li>2) It will affect the air we breathe, water we drink, food we consume, and destroy mother nature -- which, as mentioned, hold very dear.</li> <li>3) To help be a true leader in renewable energy and join the ranks of Microsoft, Starbucks, and REI.</li> </ol> <p>Bypass - become a leader - create jobs that is cost effective for you.</p> <p>A) No to Gas - Don't go from 1 bad energy source to another.  B) You will be spending and wasting millions on unwanted, unnecessary and highly polluting</p> <p>I am sure you enjoy the mountains, beaches, lakes, and forests. Help be part of this changes that can alter lives for the better.</p> <p>Thank you for your time and attention.</p> <p>Sincerely,  Diana Beas</p>

**Total Comments:** 495**In Favor:** 7**Opposed:** 432**Undecided:** 56

Filing Support	Commenter	Source	Comments
	Sarah Belle Lin	Mail	*** See attached letter for customer comment*** *** 7/31 Public Comment Hearing***
	Monyce Noelle	Mail	***See attached letter for customer comment*** *** 7/31 Public comment hearing***
	Lauren Taylor	Email	*** See attached letter for customer comment*** ***7/31 Public Comment Hearing***
	Climate Leader Aubrey	Mail	*** See attached letter for customer comment*** *** 7/31 Public comment hearing***
	Dana Ecelberger	Mail	***See Attached Letter for Customer Comment*** *** 7/31 Public Comment Hearing***  ***Additional comment came in 9/5/17***  Dockets UE-170033 & UG-170034 I was present at the Hearing in Bellevue and am attaching my comments from that hearing. Thank you for considering our input. Hello. My name is Dana Ecelberger. I am a Puget Sound resident, a Climate Reality Leader, and a grandmother. I am extremely concerned and disturbed by Puget Sound Energy's request to increase rates, while continuing to supply energy to its customers using "dirty" energy sources, such a coal and natural gas.  In light of the overwhelming evidence of climate change, and the direct link between CO2 emissions and climate change, I ask that PSE cease operation of its coal generated power facility, and that it cease mining of coal. In addition, I ask that PSE replace coal with 100% renewable, clean energy sources such as wind and solar.

			<p>Though the majority of conversation focuses on 2025 as an end date, it is my belief that we do not have that much time if we want to limit the damage of climate change to its current state of increasing climate instability, rising sea levels, melting permafrost, increased wildfires, and rapidly disappearing species. We must move now to stop further contributions of CO2 to our beleaguered atmosphere.</p> <p>Renewable energy is now within dollars of the cost of coal energy production, so economics are no longer a viable argument for continuing to pollute the atmosphere with dirty energy production. If PSE were to switch to 100% renewable energy, the net impact on PSE's customers would be an estimated 4% increase, after applying offsets.</p> <p>At least half of PSE's service territory has formally adopted King County's strategic climate action plan to be 100% renewable by 2025, or sooner. Clearly the customer base is committed to clean energy, and PSE should strive to provide its customers with the energy they are demanding.</p> <p>King County, city governments, residents and some of PSE's major business customers – REI, Microsoft, Target and Starbucks – demand clean, renewable energy and Puget Sound Energy should take this seriously and make the change from coal to renewables.</p>
	Melody	Mail	<p>*** See Attached Letter for Customer Comment***  *** 7/31 Public Comment Hearing***</p>
	Michael Leggett	Mail	<p>*** See attached letter for customer comment***  *** 7/31 public comment hearing***</p>
	Tobey Roskey	Mail	<p>*** See attached letter for customer comment***  *** 7/31 public comment hearing***</p>
	Jessica Engel	Mail	<p>*** See attached letter for customer comment***  *** 7/31 Public Comment hearing***</p>
	Lori-Ann Tschirhart	Mail	<p>***See attached letter for customer comment***  *** 7/31 Public comment hearing***</p>

**Total Comments:** 495**In Favor:** 7**Opposed:** 432**Undecided:** 56

Filing Support	Commenter	Source	Comments
	Daniela Shuman	Mail	*** See attached letter for customer comment*** *** 7/31 Public comment hearing***
	Michaela Leung	Mail	*** See attached letter for customer comment*** *** 7/31 Public comment hearing***
	Treva Coe Gabrisch	Mail	***See Attached letter for customer comment*** *** 7/31 Public comment hearing***
	Nimal Gruehsardera	Mail	*** See attached letter for customer comment*** *** 7/31 Public comment hearing***
	Jessica Kim		*** See attached letter for customer comment*** *** 7/31 Public comment hearing***
	Sidnee Peelwright	Mail	***See attached letter for customer comment*** *** 7/31 public comment hearing***
	Holly J Lee	Mail	*** See attached letter for customer comment*** *** 7/31 Public comment hearing***
	J B Hoover	Mail	***See attached letter for customer comment*** *** 7/31 Public comment hearing***
	Peehminnie	Mail	*** See attached letter for customer comment*** *** 7/31 Public comment hearing***
	Linda M. Khandro	Mail	*** See attached letter for customer comment*** *** 7/31 Public comment hearing***
	Marian Wineman	Mail	*** See attached letter for customer comment*** *** 7/31 Public comment hearing***
	David Perk	Mail	*** See attached letter for customer comment*** *** 7/31 Public comment hearing***

**Total Comments:** 495**In Favor:** 7**Opposed:** 432**Undecided:** 56

Filing Support	Commenter	Source	Comments
	Delbert Nord	Mail	*** See attached letter for customer comment*** *** 7/31 Public comment hearing***
	Madelynn Nore	Mail	***See attached letter for customer comment*** *** 7/31 Public comment hearing***
	Terry Sullivan	Mail	*** See attached letter for customer comment*** *** 7/31 Public comment hearing***
	Thomas & Sheryl Watson	Mail	***SEE ATTACHED LETTER FOR CUSTOMER COMMENT***
	Stephanie Barbee	Mail	***SEE ATTACHED LETTER FOR CUSTOMER COMMENT*** ***Customer attended 7-31-17 public comment hearing***
	Don Marsh, President CENSE	Mail	***See attached letter for customer comment*** *** 7/31 Public Comment Hearing***
	Michael Steele	Mail	***See attached letter for customer comment*** *** 7/31 Public comment hearing***
	Unknown 2	Mail	***See attached letter for customer comment*** *** 7/31 public comment hearing***
	Mary Haley	Mail	*** See attached letter for customer comment*** *** 7/31 Public comment hearing***
	Sara Williams	Mail	*** See attached letter for customer comment*** *** 7/31 Public comment hearing***

**Total Comments:** 495**In Favor:** 7**Opposed:** 432**Undecided:** 56

Filing Support	Commenter	Source	Comments
	Meara Heubach	Mail	*** See attached letter for customer comment*** *** 7/31 Public comment hearing***
	Renee Ostrem	Mail	*** See attached letter for customer comment*** *** 7/31 Public comment hearing***
	Lauren A. Millam	Mail	*** See attached letter for customer comment*** *** 7/31 Public comment hearing***
	Wendy Dubrow	Mail	*** See attached letter for customer comment*** *** 7/31 Public comment hearing***
	Zach Johnson	Mail	*** See attached letter for customer comment*** *** 7/31 Public comment hearing***
	Louis McGill	Email	*** See attached letter for customer comment*** *** 7/31 Public Comment Hearing***
	Eloise Steere	Mail	***See attached letter for customer comment*** ***7/31 Public Comment Hearing***
	Mary Sheare	Mail	*** See attached letter for customer comment*** *** 7/31 Public comment hearing***
	Cedar Kelly	Mail	*** See attached letter for customer comment*** *** 7/31 Public comment hearing***
	Paul Johnson	Mail	*** See attached letter for customer comment*** ***7/31/public comment hearing***

**Total Comments:** 495**In Favor:** 7**Opposed:** 432**Undecided:** 56

Filing Support	Commenter	Source	Comments
	Paige Magen	Mail	*** See attached letter for customer comment*** *** 7/31 Public Comment Hearing***
	John H. Calvin	Mail	*** See attached letter for customer comment*** *** 7/31 Public comment hearing***
	Cheryl B. Goehrs	Mail	*** See attached letter for customer comment*** *** 7/31 Public comment hearing***
	Karen Nelson	Mail	*** See attached letter for customer comment*** *** 7/31 Public Comment Hearing***
	Steve Richard	Mail	*** See attached letter for customer comment*** *** 7/31 Public comment hearing***
	Dana J.	Mail	*** See attached letter for customer comment*** *** 7/31 Public Comment hearing***
	Narayan Salanbe	Mail	*** See attached letter for customer comment*** *** 7/31 Public comment hearing***
	Grace Campbell	Mail	*** See attached letter for customer comment*** *** 7/31 Public comment hearing***
	Wendi Slover	Mail	*** See attached letter for customer comment*** *** 7/31 Public comment hearing***
	Theodore Todd	Mail	*** See attached letter for customer comment*** *** 7/31 Public comment hearing***

**Total Comments:** 495**In Favor:** 7**Opposed:** 432**Undecided:** 56

Filing Support	Commenter	Source	Comments
	Kathy Campbell	Mail	*** See attached letter for customer comment*** *** 7/31 Public Comment Hearing***
	Benjamin Sibelman	Mail	*** See attached letter for customer comment*** *** 7/31 Public comment hearing***
	Marc Krasnowsky	Mail	*** See attached letter for customer comment*** *** 7/31 Public comment hearing***
	Deborah Stewart	Mail	*** See attached letter for customer comment*** *** 7/31 Public Comment Hearing***
	Selca Peterson	Mail	*** See attached letter for customer comment*** *** 7/31 Public comment hearing***
	April McMorris	Mail	*** See attached letter for customer comment*** *** 7/31 Public comment hearing***
	Maris Abelson	Mail	*** See attached letter for customer comment*** *** 7/31 Public Comment Hearing***
	Cassie Starr	Mail	*** See attached letter for customer comment*** *** 7/31 Public Comment Hearing***
	Marlene Mouro	Mail	*** See attached letter for customer comment*** *** 7/31 Public Comment Hearing***
	Peter Marshall - Eastside Audubon Society Conserva	Mail	*** See attached letter for customer comment*** *** 7/31 Public Comment Hearing***
	Ronald Snell	Mail	*** See attached letter for customer comment*** ***7/31 Public comment hearing***

**Total Comments:** 495**In Favor:** 7**Opposed:** 432**Undecided:** 56

Filing Support	Commenter	Source	Comments
	Frank Souliere	Mail	*** See attached letter for customer comment*** *** 7/31 Public Comment hearing***
	Nancy Corr	Mail	*** See attached letter for customer comment*** *** 7/31 Public comment Hearing*** ***Comment Provided at the 7-31-17 Public Comment Hearing***
	Dan Streiffert	Mail	*** See attached letter for customer comment*** *** 7/31 Public Comment Hearing***
	Rachel Molloy	Mail	*** See attached letter for customer comment** *** 7/31 Public comment hearing***
	Lynne Olson	Mail	*** See attached letter for customer comment*** *** 7/31 Public comment hearing***
	Nancy Shimeall	Mail	*** See attached letter for customer comment*** ***7/31 Public Comment Hearing***
	Margo Rolf	Mail	*** See attached letter for customer comment*** *** 7/31 Public Comment Hearing***
	Shala Scolar	Email	*** See attached letter for customer comment*** *** 7/31 Public comment hearing***
	Karen	Mail	*** See attached letter for customer comment*** *** 7/31 Public comment hearing***

**Total Comments:** 495**In Favor:** 7**Opposed:** 432**Undecided:** 56

Filing Support	Commenter	Source	Comments
	Han Cause	Email	*** See attached letter for customer Comment*** ***7/31 Public Comment Hearing***
	Elizabeth Douglas	Mail	*** See attached letter for customer comment*** *** 7/31 Public Hearing Comment***
	Patrick McPhilamy III	Mail	*** See attached letter for customer comment*** *** 7/31 Public comment Hearing***
	K. Agrarul	Mail	*** See attached letter for customer comment*** *** 7/31 Public comment hearing***
	Melanie Plaut	Mail	*** See attached letter for customer comment*** ***7/31 Public comment hearing***
	Nidia K Trejo	Mail	*** See attached letter for customer comment*** *** 7/31 Public comment hearing***
	Unknown 3	Mail	*** See attached letter for customer comment*** *** 7/31 Public comment hearing***
	Pam Wise	Mail	*** See attached letter for customer comment*** *** 7/31 Public comment hearing*** ***Customer attended the 7-31-17 Public comment hearing***
	Ward Carson	Mail	*** See attached letter for customer comment*** *** 7/31 Public comment hearing***
	Steve Rubicz and Gaye Detzer	Mail	*** See attached letter for customer comment*** **** 7/31 Public comment hearing****

**Total Comments:** 495**In Favor:** 7**Opposed:** 432**Undecided:** 56

Filing Support	Commenter	Source	Comments
	Cherry Champagne	Mail	*** See attached letter for customer comment*** *** 7/31 Public comment hearing***
	Diane Emerson	Mail	*** See attached letter for customer comment*** *** 7/31 Public comment hearing***  ***Customer attended 8/31 public comment hearing - see attachment for additional comment***
	Lisa Chambers	Mail	*** See attached letter for customer comment*** *** 7/31 Public comment hearing***  ***Public Comment Hearing 8/31 - see attachment for comment***
	Andy James	Mail	*** See attached letter for customer comment*** *** 7/31 Public comment hearing***
	Northern Plains Resource Council	E-mail	Attached, please find comments submitted on behalf of Northern Plains Resource Council from our Chair, Kate French.  Svein Newman   Deputy Director of Organizing and Campaigns Northern Plains Resource Council 117 W. Broadway St.   Missoula, MT 59801 svein@northernplains.org   406-248-1154 www.northernplains.org Northern Plains Resource Council is a grassroots conservation and family agriculture group. We organize Montana citizens to protect our water quality, family farms and ranches, and unique quality of life. Check out our latest blog post!

**Total Comments:** 495

**In Favor:** 7

**Opposed:** 432

**Undecided:** 56

Filing Support	Commenter	Source	Comments
	William McPherson	E-mail	<p>PSE is seeking funding for conversion of the coal plant to gas, but that is only postponing the inevitable: energy production must shift completely away from fossil fuels.</p> <p>William McPherson</p>
	Leah Boehm	E-mail	<p>Please do NOT allow PSE to raise rates and charge consumers for their upgrades and mistakes. They are a privately owned company, sending their profits abroad.</p> <p>Please do not let them squeeze us.</p> <p>Leah Boehm</p>
	Debbie Hill	E-mail	<p>Hello Washington State UTC,</p> <p>I am writing to ask you to deny PSE's rate increase requests UE170033 and UG170034. If it is not presently illegal, it should be illegal for private companies to get their rate payers to pay for their business deals and practices.</p> <p>We ratepayers do not have a choice about whether or not to go with PSE or another natural gas company, so PSE has us over a barrel. This sounds suspiciously like taxation without representation to me – but for a private business enterprise! If I could, I would transfer all of my energy sources to electricity so as not to have to participate in this scam that is being put over on the people in Washington State. If this business model is allowed to go forward, why doesn't every business get to make other people pay for their business expenses?</p> <p>PSE'S proposed LNG plant at the Port of Tacoma is to be a huge facility, the likes of which PSE has never built (or operated) before. I do not know what insurance PSE has or has planned for the Tacoma LNG plant, but I very much doubt that any insurance they might have would be up to the job of covering any fires or explosions due to leaks, pollution, injury and/or loss of life due to</p>

these disasters. In addition, the LNG plant is in a vulnerable lahar, earthquake, and tsunami zone. Too often, big companies such as PSE simply walk away from big disasters and wait for people to sue them to try to recover what usually amounts to a fraction of their losses. Over 25 years later, for example, the people of Prince William Sound still have not been able to collect for all the damages from the Exxon Valdez oil spill. <http://www.mcclatchydc.com/news/nation-world/national/article24765529.html> (“Exxon compensation checks were too late and too little, he said.”) This leaves the City and Port of Tacoma on the hook for dealing with these problems, any of which has the potential to be catastrophic. This means that, in addition to the increases in our natural gas rates, we could face having to pay to clean up such disasters and/or pay for it with our lives or livelihoods.

The City Council of Tacoma has just approved a fire station to be located at the Port of Tacoma to handle potential disasters. It must be stated that such a fire station would be well within the blast zone in the event of an explosion at the LNG plant. PSE has stated that there is no danger of a fire (or explosion) at the LNG plant. These contradictory positions must be questioned: Either there is a danger of fires and explosions, in which case no fire crew is going to be able to combat such an event as LNG fires burn at several thousand degrees from my understanding and cannot be simply extinguished, or there is really no danger, in which case we are left to wonder why the City feels it necessary to suddenly put a fire station at the Port. I am all for fire fighters, but either way, we citizens are now going to be paying for something in which we have no voice, which endangers more lives (those of the firefighters) in addition to those already in danger in the City, Port, and nearby neighborhoods, and which makes no sense.

Finally, plans for several LNG plants in BC have recently stalled or folded in light of collapsing LNG prices due to the easy availability of fracked gas on the world market and the increasing availability of green alternative energy solutions such as wind and solar technologies. The proponents of these LNG plants have realized that they were not financially viable. <http://www.sightline.org/2017/06/28/why-has-bcs-lng-industry-stalled/> I would like to submit to you that the main reason PSE’s LNG plant looks viable now is their plan to get their ratepayers to subsidize it.

We have asked for a SEIS on the LNG plant repeatedly to no avail. The City and the Port have been presented with mountains of facts and figures, studies, and evidence of the folly of this LNG plant and still the plan goes forward. The boondoggle of turning Tacoma into a fossil fuel

			<p>sacrifice zone and getting ratepayers to do it must end.</p> <p>I ask for your urgent consideration of this letter.</p> <p>Thank you.</p> <p>Deborah Hill Tacoma, WA</p>
	Judith Chelotti	E-mail	<p>august 18,2017</p> <p>Dear Sir or Madam,</p> <p>Please deny PSE's rate increase. I am a PSE customer for natural gas. My bill for last month was \$44.00. I used \$13.00 worth of gas. So 2/3 of my bill is customer fees, delivery charges and taxes.</p> <p>There is no way to conserve to save money. The extra charges are going to fund projects that the multibillion dollar foreign investment company that owns this utility should be paying. For example the proposed LNG plant in Tacoma is going to cost customers millions of dollars in construction cost for 7% of capacity for "peak-shaving". Of note, the past cold winter the customers needed NO additional gas for home heating purposes.</p> <p>Please stand by the customers of this company. You are our only advocate. You work for us. PSE spends millions of our money for lobbying and ads to promote their business not to provide utility services. This is wrong!!</p> <p>Again, DO NOT APPROVE the rate hike. It is not for the utility services AT ALL!!</p> <p>Thank you.</p> <p>Judi Chelotti PSE customer</p>

**Total Comments:** 495**In Favor:** 7**Opposed:** 432**Undecided:** 56

Filing Support	Commenter	Source	Comments
	Jaan Carter	E-mail	<p>Dear UTC Personnel,</p> <p>It is my opinion that PSE rates are already too high. This is a company owned by an Australian BANK. While I have no issue with the local WA people who work hard for PSE and do their jobs well, as someone who makes barely over minimum wage, I don't appreciate not being warm in the winter... I can't afford to be warm; I wear a coat and cover up with blankets when I'm not in bed! This because my entire rented cottage is run on electricity, which COULD be run on solar, and we all know why it isn't.</p> <p>Now I'm hearing about Tacoma and the proposed LNG... Why in the world would we allow people from the other side of world to endanger our environment and our people and animal life with their greedy, unsafe fossil fuel facility???</p> <p>PSE is not our friend. They are not providing clean energy for our benefit, they are just about MONEY.</p> <p>So, I am NOT in favor of a rate increase, even a small one. I think we should look to clean energy, cheaper, with an eye to the future, to the environment now, and to those of us who aren't warm enough in the winter.</p> <p>Sincerely, Jaan Carter, Manchester</p>
	Tim Smetzler	Mail	<p>See attached letter from the consumer</p> <p>July 25,2017</p> <p>Utilities and Transportation Commission Consumer Protection</p>

PO Box 47250 .  
Olympia, WA 98504-7250

RE: PSE Rate Hike Request

Dear UTC Commissioner's:

I am writing to state my opposition to the granting of any requested rate increase by Puget Sound Energy. They continue to ask for rate increases, while the service goes down and rates increase. I am on a fixed income and cannot afford any increase. The commission seems to "rubber stamp" their request for any kind of increase each time they ask. I only have so much money to live on each month, I can't ask the government or others for additional money. They should also have to live on a budget, like myself and explain line for line, word for word why they need such an outrageous rate hike! The commission should represent us, the rate payer, not PSE. PSE has the highest utility rates in the state, and have a monopoly with no competition. Compare PSE's rates to others in this state. I have to have power, what choice do I have? In the winter my heat is off, and I freeze, but yet my bill remains high.

I have requested assistance with weatherization checks and they say I can request only once for any inspection. They did come out and change the light bulbs, but did nothing more.

At my expense last summer, I had to replace a pole and yard light, which cost me over \$3,000.00 for the materials, contractors, labor, inspection and licenses. I even dug the large and deep required trench myself, at considerable work and time to save money! I should not have had to pay these costs, and disputed this with PSE to no avail. It has taken me over a year to pay these bills, at extreme hardship.

I have an electric furnace in a mobile home, living at this address for over 40 years, the double wide mobile home has single pane windows, inadequate caulking, heat loss and old appliances. At one time they did have good rebates on updating these items, but they slashed or discontinued these rebates. Why? They say they want us to save money and energy and then they significantly reduce or stop the rebates! Is it because they were losing too much money, and an overwhelming demand? That's why, according to PSE persons I talked to.

In addition, I pay more each month for two PSE light poles and halogen light rentals, than my entire monthly light bill!! How can this be? Why do these rates go up rather than down over a period of time. I get a monthly "atta boy" mailing from PSE saying how I am in the "lowest bracket" in the area for saving electricity, but my rates are still unaffordable. Light poles and halogen lights should go down and depreciate.

Getting through on the phone to PSE is another experience, waiting up to five minutes; and when you do reach them they are not polite, and provide poor customer service, with a "take it or leave it" attitude. 40 years ago PSE was a local company, easy to work with, and cared about its customers; not anymore, it is owned by a firm in Australia, out of country, and focuses only on profits, nothing more.

PSE is price gouging the consumer to make huge profits at our expense, fines they paid the UTC for negligence shown in recent news stories, and fines PSE received for lack of following regulations; should not be recouped by profits from me, and others; thus is another reason for the requested rate increase, recovering their losses at the rate payers expense? What was PSE's profits the past 3 years? Why do they need this high rate increase? By cost savings, having a hiring freeze, better oversight and accountability I think they could achieve this. THE UTC has given PSE strict guidelines to follow in the future as a result of investigations and violations; if PSE does not comply will they be fined again, and the ratepayers asked for another rate increase?

Does the UTC thoroughly and intensely question and investigate PSE? Does the UTC speak for the consumer? I don't think so, being told by one person "we have to give them a raise if they request it". What? I can't get a raise if I ask for it from Social Security! The commission should be voted in by the electorate, rate payers, not the Governor! We would have more of a voice I believe, rather than political partisanship. How does the public, ratepayers have a voice with the UTC, and hold them accountable? Can they be recalled or fired?

Please add this letter and my comments to the commission's review of PSE's requested rate increase. I would also like a copy of the meeting notes sent to me, and the final outcome of this hearing and UTC's decision. Thank you.

Tim Smetzler  
8124 James Road SW Rochester, WA 978579

**Total Comments:** 495

**In Favor:** 7

**Opposed:** 432

**Undecided:** 56

Filing Support	Commenter	Source	Comments
	Shelly Bowman	E-mail	<p>Hi PSE,</p> <p>Use solar and wind and other innovation to supply cheaper sustainable energy and stop gauging the planet and your fellow humans. No Rate increase. No Coal use!!</p> <p>PSE/China we are one planet, one people. Save the planet, stop the destruction.</p> <p>Thank you Shelly Bowman Redmond, Bellevue, Kirkland, Renton Wa</p> <p>Sent from phone with spelling mind of its own</p>

Filing Support	Commenter	Source	Comments
	Bob Zeigler	E-mail	<p>SEE ATTACHED ATTACHMENT FROM CONSUMER</p> <p>Sent from Mail for Windows 10 Dear Washington State Utilities and Transportation Commission,</p> <p>I have the following comments for your August 31 Public Hearing as well as a short powerpoint showing the cumulative impacts and risks from continued and expanded use of fossil fuels. I know I may not have time at your hearing to present so I'm sending it to you in advance of the hearing. Please share with Commissioners.</p> <p>With the Federal Administration moving to undo environmental protections and expanding development of fossil fuel for energy sources, it falls upon states to expand efforts to protect the publics' health, safety and welfare. I urge you to end coal as well as natural gas expansion in our electrical energy production by PSE.</p> <p>Climate Change Impacts are real and affecting us now with weather extremes from drought and fire to floods and hurricane. See Final Draft Climate Change Science from Federal Agencies and 18 Universities.</p> <p>The link to it is: <a href="http://www.nytimes.com/packages/pdf/climate/2017/climate-report-final-draft-clean.pdf">http://www.nytimes.com/packages/pdf/climate/2017/climate-report-final-draft-clean.pdf</a></p> <p>Thank you very much,</p> <p>Bob Zeigler 1102A Creekwood Ct. SE Olympia, WA 98501 (360) 570-0848 zeiglerbob@msn.com</p>

**Total Comments:** 495**In Favor:** 7**Opposed:** 432**Undecided:** 56

Filing Support	Commenter	Source	Comments
	Lorraine Johnston	Phone	When it come to assessing more money to pay for the change over from coal to other clean power sources I have to take a very cautious, conservative approach towards rate increases we are retire. We have to keep a close eye on all additional assessments that will become our responsibility. Currently property tax is a corker we are doing without an internet overhead which is becoming more difficult daily we are doing without any form of cable or paid television service we are relying on free over the air television. Any expense of living increase is not a welcome thought in this household.
	Nancy Murphy	E-mail	<p>I am a PSE customer on Vashon Island and a member of the Vashon Climate Action Group. Washington is in such a unique position to lead the nation with renewable energy alternatives, so I request that you do everything in your power to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• aggressively move PSE forward on the timeline to decommission their coal-powered plants and</li> <li>• require carbon-free alternatives in place of the proposed natural gas plant.</li> </ul> <p>Thank you,</p> <p>- Nancy Murphy</p> <p>206-778-5155, murphy.vashon@gmail.com            PO Box 13569,            Burton, WA 98013</p>

**Total Comments:** 495**In Favor:** 7**Opposed:** 432**Undecided:** 56

Filing Support	Commenter	Source	Comments
	Donna Gillespie	E-mail	As a residential customer I DO NOT support application by PSE to higher base rate in addition to higher meter rates. PSE is NOT entitled to Base increase. Any increase should only be for rates which encourage appropriate energy usage but definitely NOT BASE rate. Donna Gillespie 183 Kennedy Rd Point Roberts, WA 98281 360-945-1067
	Oksana Savolyuk, Multi-Service Center	Mail	***See attached letter from MSC Energy Program Director Oksana Savolyuk***
	City of Tumwater	E-mail	***See attached letter from Tumwater Mayor Pete Kmet***
	City of Olympia	Mail	***See letter from Olympia Mayor Pro Tem Nathaniel Jones***
	King County et al	E-mail	***See attached letter for public comment from King County, Issaquah, Mercer Island, and Snoqualmie***  ***Councilmember Dave Upthgrove provided comment at the 8-31-17 public comment hearing***
	City of Bellevue	E-mail	***See attached comment from John Stokes Mayor of Bellevue***
	Milt Hammon	Phone	VM/Deborah Reynolds  Calling in opposition to the increase in costs and billing PSE is seeking on the electrical bill. I think it's exorbitant and not really called for.

**Total Comments:** 495

**In Favor:** 7

**Opposed:** 432

**Undecided:** 56

Filing Support	Commenter	Source	Comments
	Tom Gillespie	E-mail	<p>Sent from Mail for Windows 10</p> <p>As customer I DO NOT support application by PSE to higher base rate in addition to higher meter rates. PSE is NOT entitled to Base increase. Any increase should only be for rates which encourage appropriate energy usage but definitely NOT BASE rate. Tom Gillespie 183 Kennedy Rd Point Roberts, WA 98281 360-945-1067</p>
	Susie Rather	E-mail	<p>I believe the consumers deserve a share of the profits by a decrease in gas and electricity bills!</p> <p>Sent from my iPhone</p>
	Angela London	E-mail	<p>***Customer also attended the 8-31-17 public comment hearing, see attachments for hard copy comments***</p> <p>Dear commissioners Danner Rendahl and Balasbas ,</p> <p>Thank you for considering my comments.</p> <p>The mission of the WUTC is to protect the people of Washington by ensuring that PSE services are safe, available, reliable and fairly priced. I would like to talk about safety and price. I intend to testify tomorrow and give supporting documents during the testimony.</p> <p>Here are quotes from PSE's own website:</p> <p>“At PSE, we're putting our energy into clean power solutions that help our customers and the</p>

environment.”

“Doing smart things for our customers and the right thing for our planet is what PSE is all about.”

“One of the ways Puget Sound Energy demonstrates its commitment to the environment is by providing our customers with reliable and ecologically sustainable energy services.”

These statements do not comfort me. PSE advertises environmentally sustainable values to their rate holders while being held by Macquarie Consortium, not only the largest Australian investment bank but also Macquarie is one of the largest gas production and distribution companies in the US. Conflict? I think so.

PSE claims to be concerned about the environment while they run and operate Colstrip, one of the largest CO<sub>2</sub>, SO<sub>2</sub> and mercury emitting coal plants in the US! EPA reports that the 2,094-megawatt Colstrip Generating Station emits nearly 15 million metric tons of CO<sub>2</sub> per year, placing it among the top 20 carbon-producing power plants in the United States. PSE owns 32.3% of Colstrip and is responsible for emitting about 5 million metric tons of carbon per year from this plant alone.

Currently 60% of our energy comes from Carbon sourced fossil fuels in a region that has a surplus of hydropower and resources prime for harnessing wind and solar. Is this because it is cost effective? I don't think so.

When talking about cost of electricity, we must talk about environmental cost and factor in climate change. Our least cost plan, must require that environmental externalities, especially the irreversible environmental costs of climate change, be quantified and explicitly weighed during the resource selection process.

Regarding monetary cost, first, we have to consider carbon taxes and future limitations on using fracked gas within our great State and beyond this current Federal administration that would drive up the cost of LNG. Without a doubt, these costs would be passed on to us, the rate payers.

Second, as you may be aware, the Regional Greenhouse Gas Initiative (RGGI) was the first mandatory market based program in the United States to reduce greenhouse gas emissions. The

RGGI established a regional cap on the amount of CO2 pollution that power plants can emit by issuing a limited number of trade-able CO2 allowances. The RGGI is a cooperative effort among a region of nine states (Connecticut, Delaware, Maine, Maryland, Massachusetts, New Hampshire, New York, Rhode Island, and Vermont) to cap and reduce CO2 emissions from the power sector. RGGI compliance obligations apply to fossil-fueled power plants 25MW and larger within the nine-state region.

In a July 2016 RGGI outcomes report it shows that electricity prices across the 9 state region decreased by 3.4% between 2008 and 2016. However, electricity prices in states not establishing CO2 caps, electricity prices increased an average of 7.2%.

I looked on PSE's website and found their reports comparing 2008 to 2016 the approximate range of the report, prices have increased 14.81%! This in a stagnant economy where oil and coal have dropped substantially and in a region where we have the largest hydroelectric power producer in the United States.

Let us tell PSE/Macquarie we are not afraid to hold them accountable. Let's protect the mission of the WUTC , keep our utilities safe and require the price of externalities be considered. Don't let PSE tell you that our only viable option is LNG as we know they have an excellent marketing department. Let's not fund Macquarie's investments in gas production and distribution. Require PSE to close Colstrip 3 and 4 before 2025, skip LNG and go straight to renewable energy. It is what we, the ratepayers want! It is what the planet and our future generations need!

Thank you for your time.

Angela London Angslondon@gmail.com  
PSE Customer –  
Vashon, Washington and Ferndale, Washington.  
Vashon Climate Action Group.

**Total Comments:** 495**In Favor:** 7**Opposed:** 432**Undecided:** 56

Filing Support	Commenter	Source	Comments
	Matthew Tirman	E-mail	<p>Commissioners of Washington UTC,</p> <p>As a resident of Bainbridge Island, PSE customer, and candidate for City Council, I strongly urge the Commission to take the staffs ' recommendation and reduce the rates by 2.2%. This is only fair for those homeowners and renters hit by ever increasing taxes and fees during this boom economy.</p> <p>Thank you for your consideration.</p> <p>Best,</p> <p>Matthew Tirman</p> <p>4546 NE Mill Heights Cir Bainbridge IS, WA 98110</p>

**Total Comments:** 495**In Favor:** 7**Opposed:** 432**Undecided:** 56

Filing Support	Commenter	Source	Comments
	Chrystyne L. Braaten	E-mail	<p>Hello</p> <p>I am apposed to this &amp; any rate increase for electric customers as we are being singled out and discriminated against because we are not natural gas users which is very dangerous to use, and why should electric customers pay more then natural gas customers?</p> <p>Also I saw a story on KIRO 7 last night a shop owner that his business was destroyed by the Green Lake natural gas explosion last year and PSE would not honor his claim for his damages when PSE was fined for the gas line and it took over 4 month for PSE to get back to him and then denied his claim. The owner kept after PSE for an answer which in it self is outrageous amount of time for it to take. The story said that he had a small insurance policy that covered his food contents. The owner just wanted to be made whole for his loss due to PSE negligent. The insurance policy this business owner had should have nothing to do with making this business owner whole. PSE can not have it both way when it is at fault.</p> <p>Thank you</p> <p>Sincerely Chrystyne L. Braaten</p>

**Total Comments:** 495**In Favor:** 7**Opposed:** 432**Undecided:** 56

Filing Support	Commenter	Source	Comments
	Edwin Melendez	E-mail	<p>Hello,</p> <p>I am writing you to express in the strongest way possible that I DO NOT SUPPORT a rate increase from PSE. I found it discouraging that PSE has effectively lobbied against the rates they have to pay to Solar Panel owners. Now, they are asking for us, its customers, to pay more for supposed infrastructure improvements. PSE is a business who makes sufficient money in profits to cover the financial cost for improvements. We should not be FORCED to pay more just because they want to save their own money.</p> <p>Humbly,</p> <p>Edwin A Melendez II PA-C Lummi Healing Spirit Clinic ph 360 380-6950 fax 360 384-2350</p>
	Karol Erickson	E-mail	<p>I strongly urge UTC to set the depreciation schedule (payment plan) for PSE to pay off their obligations to the Colstrip coal plant as quickly as possible. It is IMPERATIVE that PSE get off of coal as soon as possible.</p> <p>Thank you for considering my comment.</p> <p>- Karol Erickson, Olympia WA</p> <p>Sent from my iPhone</p>

**Total Comments:** 495**In Favor:** 7**Opposed:** 432**Undecided:** 56

Filing Support	Commenter	Source	Comments
	Barbara Phinney	E-mail	<p>Dear UTC of WA,</p> <p>Please DENY PSE's rate increases UE170033 &amp; UG170034. It is very important that PSE and not PSE customers pay for environmental disasters they create, whether it's coal mine clean ups, neighborhoods impacted by explosion through their negligence, LNG super hazards in Tacoma, or the army of lawyers &amp; lobbyists PSE hires to hide all of these sleazy business practices! The residents paying for utilities should not be liable for bad or risky decisions made by PSE. Please deny PSE's rate increase requests because it is the right thing to do for the people whose interests you represent, the residents of WA State. Thank you?</p> <p>Sincerely,  Barbara Phinney  12248 Phinney Ave N  Seattle, WA 98133</p> <p>Barbara</p>

**Total Comments:** 495**In Favor:** 7**Opposed:** 432**Undecided:** 56

Filing Support	Commenter	Source	Comments
	Linda DeSantis	E-mail	<p>To whom it may concern:</p> <p>PSE needs to pay for the environmental disasters they create, whether it's coal mine clean ups, neighborhoods they explode through their negligence, LNG superhazards in Tacoma, or the army of lawyers &amp; greenwashers PSE hires to hide all of these sleazy business practices!</p> <p>Better yet, why worry about being responsible for the mess you leave behind?? Leave that for someone who actually has a shred of decency and has respect for the environment. If there is an LNG plant built in Tacoma I know of many families who will sell their homes and leave the area. You will render Tacoma and the surrounding area a ghost town. Is that what you want? Do you really want to mess with the fragile balance of the ecosystem and drive people from their homes?</p> <p>You know that fossil fuels are soon to be a thing of the past. Why suck the earth dry just to line your pockets? Shame on you for your greed and selfishness.</p> <p>-- Linda DeSantis DeSantis Design 253-332-7291</p>
	Jennifer Minich	E-mail	<p>Jen Minich 4034 Rock Maple Ln NW Apt 204 Box F8 Olympia, WA 98502</p> <p>8/31/2017</p> <p>UTC Headquarters</p>

Room 206  
1300 S. Evergreen Park Drive S.W.  
Olympia, Washington

Dear UTC Commissioners:

I came by for the public comment, and it was so well attended, there was simply no way to stay. So, here are my public comments as a residential ratepayer of Puget Sound Energy.

I have had three outages in the past year, some during storms, but once when there wasn't. These were not short outages either. I find their current lack of reliability to be troubling. For historical comparison, I have also had problems with unreliability with Puget Sound Energy not bringing power back for days during storms for the past 25 years actually. And that is with coal as part of the energy portfolio, which they say is needed for reliability.

If Puget Sound Energy could be encouraged to go both green with greater reliability, I am all for it. I encourage you to look into appropriate rate setting, meet the utilities' needs to create sustainable, reliable power using the cleanest source available and using the most modern technology. In Washington, we have a culture of appreciating our environment and being innovators and problem solvers. Let's live our values and use these skills. I'd especially like to see investment in new solar systems with residential and commercial new building and renovation, and I'd like to see investment in other renewable sources.

If the 2.6% increase pays for linemen and women to promptly repair the lines when they are down by investing in the kind of lines that weather outdoor conditions best, invest in underground line infrastructure or other practical, impactful long-term solutions, then I'd support that. I do not support a rate increase for band-aid 'solutions.' Also, I do not know the status of grid redundancy in my area – perhaps building in some backup redundancy would help with the outage frequency. In any case, something is wrong with the utility service I receive. And the lack of reliability is not due to the source; it's due to the transmission.

Finally, it is very important to me that utility generation be considered safe - safe from polluting our environment, accidents, or terroristic threats. I also am concerned when energy generation and transmission is provided by companies that are not domestic companies. It's easier to support rate

			<p>increases to an American company where you know the money will stay and circulate locally. It does trouble me that our energy company is held by foreign interests. From a national security perspective, I'm not sure how this is safe.</p> <p>Thank you for taking my public comments.</p> <p>Sincerely, Jen Minich</p>
	<p>Ken Day</p>	<p>E-mail</p>	<p>Dear Sirs: I received notice of a petition for General Rate increases from PSE. I strongly recommend against allowing this general increase in residential rates for the following reasons.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Every technical/ operational publication from the electric power industry is addressing the need to ramp up power production to service the marijuana growing industry. If more power is required to grow dope, I suggest that the marijuana industry pay a premium for their power, maybe as much as twice what the residential rates are. They can afford it- they're flush with money that they can't legally spend and like tobacco the pricing mechanism is a great way to drive up prices and drive down consumption.</li> <li>2. PSE needs to demand a price decrease from the wind and solar energy providers. While politicians have created a protected class of suppliers (i.e., green energy providers), these power sources are apparently free to charge whatever they desire and the power companies are under mandated to buy it at prices far above market rate for power from hydro, or other more common sources.</li> </ol> <p>Please deny the PSE request for rate increase and tell them to extract additional required revenue from the marijuana industry and the high-priced solar and wind energy companies.</p> <p>Regards, Ken Day 360.434.8656 A PSE customer since 1976</p> <p>Sent from Mail for Windows 10</p>

**Total Comments:** 495

**In Favor:** 7

**Opposed:** 432

**Undecided:** 56

Filing Support	Commenter	Source	Comments
	Kent and Maureen Canny	E-mail	<p>Dear Commissioners Danner, Rendahl and Balasbas,</p> <p>Thank you for accommodating the crowd and listening throughout the lengthy comment period during last night's hearing. My husband and I were unable to stay the entire time but we heard that it went quite late and we're appreciative of your time.</p> <p>We, too, hope that you adjust PSE's payment schedule for the Colstrip facility so that the two units are retired by at least 2025!</p> <p>Many others spoke very eloquently about getting off coal and onto renewable sources of energy. We wholeheartedly support those statements and hope that this happens as soon as possible</p> <p>Thank you for your reasoned decisions as you "protect the people of Washington by ensuring that investor-owned utility and transportation services are safe, available, reliable and fairly priced."</p> <p>Sincerely, Maureen Canny (and Kent Canny)</p>

Filing Support	Commenter	Source	Comments
	Sharon Dunn	E-mail	<p>Hello: I am a customer of Puget Sound Energy and live on Whidbey Island. I would rate their service as adequate but I am appalled by their proposed rate increased for residential customers. Although the change of 2.5% sounds small, I live on a fixed income provided by Social Security and small investments. Every year my expenses increase due to the rising cost of health care insurance, auto and home insurance, water service, food, etc. This is one more increase I cannot afford.</p> <p>Puget Sound Energy is a FOR-PROFIT electrical service provider. They are my sole source for electrical service - there is no competition and I have no choice in where I obtain my electrical service. Writing to you is my only way of asking for relief for this lack of competition.</p> <p>I imagine Kimberly J. Harris, with a salary of \$3,805.639, according to my research, can afford an increase; I can't. I recently investigated PSE's "Warm Home" program but, poor as I am, I do not qualify - and the process looks unnecessarily complicated. I would like to understand why CEOs are paid such outrageous salaries. My research informed me that the salary for Seattle City Light's CEO is \$340,000 per year - nothing like what Ms. Harris is paid. Seattle City Light is a non-profit public utility and for many years I received their very satisfactory service. When I moved to Whidbey Island upon retirement I immediately paid more for electrical service and experienced poorer service in the form of frequent outages.</p> <p>I strongly believe that my only choice of electrical service provider should not be a PRIVATE FOR-PROFIT company. Several years ago citizens on Whidbey Island put forth a plan to have its own not-for-profit public utility as an electrical provider. PSE ran a strong campaign against this idea and poorly-informed and scared voters bought their story. What I noticed was that my PSE service dramatically improved after this scare. PSE began a program of being pro-active in terms of maintenance (tree trimming in particular) to reduce outages after this scare and outages were reduced. I believe service was improved only because the idea of a non-profit public utility scared. PSE.</p> <p>I cannot support the reasoning behind PSE's proposed rate increase.</p> <p>Sharon Dunn 2678 Currant Court Greenbank, WA 98253</p>

**Total Comments:** 495**In Favor:** 7**Opposed:** 432**Undecided:** 56

Filing Support	Commenter	Source	Comments
	Phyllis Clausen	Mail	***SEE ATTACHED LETTER FOR COMMENT***
	Rebecca Canright	Mail	***SEE ATTACHED LETTER FOR COMMENT***
	Kevin Jones	E-mail	<p>SEE ATTACHED THE COMMENTS PROVIDED BY CONSUMER</p> <p>My testimony is in the enclosed PDF document, and copied below. Thank you, Kevin Jones</p> <p>Climate Change and Safety Concerns regarding Natural Gas Docket # UE-170033 and UG-170034 Testimony from Kevin Jones, Carbon Free PSE – Vashon campaign lead kevinjonvash@gmail.com 206-463-1766</p> <p>***Public Comment Hearing 8/31 - See attachment for comment***</p>
	Sarah E. Myhre, Ph.D	E-mail	<p>Puget Sound Energy: Phase out Colstrip coal mine by 2025 To prevent climate catastrophe, Washington State utilities must uphold ambitious climate commitments On August 31st 2017, in Olympia, Washington, concerned citizens will be given the chance to provide testimony and public comment regarding Puget Sound Energy's (PSE) 2017 Rate Case—in respect to how PSE rolls over costs to Washington State energy customers. The PSE Rate Case is also an opportune time to strongly, publicly advocate for conservative and long-term climate change decision making. Climate change is the defining problem of our time. As members of 500 Women Scientists here in Seattle, an international non-profit focused on science and public service, we advocate for PSE to pay off and close the remaining 2 coal-fired units in Colstrip, Montana by 2025.</p>

Not only are we scientists and citizens, we are also customers of PSE—and in that regard we expect PSE to align and uphold meaningful climate commitments. We see analogous commitments from King County, Microsoft, Starbucks, Target, and REI, to transition away from coal towards clean, green energy by 2025. PSE should be among these regional leaders—fighting for energy solutions that do not risk the lives and livelihoods of our neighbors and our children. This is a basic civic duty—whether you are a utility, an institution, or an individual citizen.

Look at the devastation wrought by Hurricane Harvey—a hurricane made more dangerous and deadly because of climate change. We say: No More Climate Risk. No, to more frequent smoky-hot summers. No, to more intense wildfires. No, to more devastating Hurricane Harveys. We, as a state and as a society, do not have to court these terrible risks. But, changing course requires bold, decisive, insightful leadership.

We ask the Utilities and Transportation Commission to ensure that PSE is divested from Colstrip by 2025—for the health and safety of our communities, our students, and our children. The risks of climate change are real, and they are at all of our doorsteps. To be sure, leading on climate action is difficult and full of short-term conflicting interests. However, in the long-term, we are all stewarding the energy, economies, and ecosystems of the Pacific Northwest for future generations. We all share the risks of climate disruption—but on our children's shoulders sits the greatest risk. This is why we must act now.

We thank the Commission members for their time and attention,  
Seattle 500 Women Scientists

(The statement above is a submitted written comment to Washington State Utilities and Transportation Commission, regarding Puget Sound Energy's 2017 Rate Case Hearing, Dockets UE-170033 & UG-170034)

Sarah E. Myhre, Ph.D.  
Postdoctoral Scholar  
Future of Ice Initiative  
School of Oceanography  
University of Washington

Ocean Science Building, OCE 307

Case: 170033

Title: PSE GRC

PI Coordinator: Andrew Roberts

Staff Lead:

			(206) 221-6711 (808) 381-9177 cell  @SarahEMyhre sarahmyhre.com sea500womensci.com
	Medfordgrad	E-mail	PSE needs to close colstrip coal plants as promised and PSE shareholders, and not struggling families, should pay for the environmental disasters PSE creates, whether it's coal mine clean ups, exploding Seattle neighborhoods through negligence, or the army of lawyers & greenwashers PSE employs to obscure their business practices! Thank you for your consideration of my concerns regarding Puget Sound Energy's proposed rate changes.

**Total Comments:** 495**In Favor:** 7**Opposed:** 432**Undecided:** 56

Filing Support	Commenter	Source	Comments
	Alan and Pat Wald	E-mail	<p>Hearings Board for Puget Sound Energy,</p> <p>My husband and I are both a user and producer of solar power for PSE. We are also a green energy program customer.</p> <p>We currently operate a 10 KW solar grid on our farm. Our solar production has been economically beneficial, practical and rewarding. Our panels were built in Washington and installed by a local business, South Sound Solar.</p> <p>Our neighbors were interested in our system, so we went over with them how we financed it, how long it would take to pay it off, and our process of installation. They had the exact array installed in their backyard.</p> <p>I agree that the closing of the coal plant must respect the people in Montana who's livelihood depends on it, but their future also depends on whether we can reduce our carbon production fast enough to prevent the most dire consequences of global warming.</p> <p>I have spent my life working for children, first in the public schools and then 17 years as educator and designer for the Hands On Children's Museum. Our children will live in the consequences of the decisions we make today. We have a better direction we can take them and we need to begin now.</p> <p>Please close the Colstrip plant as soon as possible and replace it with renewable energy sources.</p> <p>Thank you, Pat and Alan Wald</p>
	Melanie Boots	Mail	***SEE ATTACHED LETTER FOR COMMENT***

**Total Comments:** 495**In Favor:** 7**Opposed:** 432**Undecided:** 56

Filing Support	Commenter	Source	Comments
	Margaret Murphy	Mail	***SEE ATTACHED LETTER FOR COMMENT***
	Shelly Ferer	Mail	***SEE ATTACHED LETTER FOR COMMENT***
	Paul Elwood	In person	Public Comment Hearing See attachment
	Mary Russell	In person	Public Comment Hearing 8/31 See attachment for Customer Comment
	Michael Prokopovich	Mail	***SEE ATTACHED LETTER FOR COMMENT***
	Kathleen Saul	In person	Public Comment Hearing 8/31 See attachment for comment
	Patricia Dickason, President League of Women Voter	In person	Public Comment Hearing 8/31 See Attachment for Comment
	Judy Bardin	In person	Public Comment Hearing 8/31 See Attachment for comment
	Tom Crawford	In person	Public Comment Hearing 8/31 See attachment for comment
	Donna M. Ewing and Sue P. Minahan	In person	Public Comment Hearing 8/31 See Attachment for comment
	Judy Olmstead	In person	Public comment hearing 8/31 See attachment for comment

**Total Comments:** 495**In Favor:** 7**Opposed:** 432**Undecided:** 56

Filing Support	Commenter	Source	Comments
	Greg Saul	In person	Public Comment Hearing 8/31 See attachment for comment
	Janet Hedgepath	In person	Public Comment Hearing 8/31 See attachment for comment
	Pat Rasmussen	In person	Public Comment Hearing 8/31 See attachment for comment
	Dan M. Hall	In person	Public Comment Hearing 8/31 See attachment for comment
	Roy C. Treadway	In person	Public Comment Hearing 8/31 See attachment for comment
	Judy Twedt	In person	Public Comment Hearing 8/31 See attachment for comment
	Elizabeth Rodrick	In person	Public Comment Hearing 8/31 See attachment for comment
	Debra Jaqua	In person	Public Comment Hearing 8/31 See attachment for Comment
	Joy Vartanian	In person	Public Comment Hearing 8/31 See attachment for comment
	Janet Siano	In person	Public Comment Hearing 8/31 See attachment for comment
	Patricia Holm	In person	Public Comment Hearing 8/31 See attachment for comment

**Total Comments:** 495**In Favor:** 7**Opposed:** 432**Undecided:** 56

Filing Support	Commenter	Source	Comments
	Barbara Scavezze	In person	Public Comment Hearing 8/31 See attachment for comment
	Rhonda Hunter	In person	Public Comment Hearing 8/31 See attachment for comment
	Peggy Benton and David Edwards	In person	Public comment hearing 8/31 See attachment for comment
	Susan Sandwell	In person	Public Comment Hearing 8/31 See attachment for comment
	William Beattie	In person	Public Comment Hearing 8/31 See attachment for comment
	Virginia Lohr	In person	Public Comment Hearing 8/31 See attachment for comment
	Steve Hofer	In person	Public Comment Hearing 8/31 See attachment for comment
	Bruce Speight ED of Enironment Washington	In person	Public Comment Hearing 8/31 See attachment for comment
	Dave Bradley	In person	Public Comment Hearing 8/31 See attachment for comment
	Nathaniel Jones Mayor Pro Tem Olympia	In person	Public Comment Hearing 8/31 See attachment for comment

**Total Comments:** 495**In Favor:** 7**Opposed:** 432**Undecided:** 56

Filing Support	Commenter	Source	Comments
	Washington State Legislature Letter to PSE CEO	In person	Public Comment Hearing 8/31 See Attachment for comment
	Robert Briggs	In person	Public Comment Hearing 8/31 See attachment for comment
	Lisa Ornsten	Mail	See attachment for comment
	A.R. Kriseln	Mail	See attachment for comment
	F. Bredensterner	Mail	See attachment for comment
	Pamela Hanson	In person	***Comment provided at 8-31-17 public comment hearing***
	Chelsea Rustad	In person	***Comment provided at 8-31-17 public comment hearing***
	Grace Cristie	In person	***Comment provided at 8-31-17 public comment hearing***
	Elyette Weinstein	In person	***Comment provided at 8-31-17 public comment hearing***
	Joedy Morrow	In person	***Comment provided at 8-31-17 public comment hearing***
	Jess Koski	In person	***Comment provided at 8-31-17 public comment hearing***
	Michael Lilliquist, Bellingham City Council	In person	***Comment provided at 8-31-17 public comment hearing***
	Stew Honderson	In person	***Comment provided at 8-31-17 public comment hearing***
	Walter R. Jorgensen	In person	***Comment provided at 8-31-17 public comment hearing***
	Lisa Riener	In person	***Comment provided at 8-31-17 public comment hearing***
	Claudia Riedener	In person	***Comment provided at 8-31-17 public comment hearing***

**Total Comments:** 495**In Favor:** 7**Opposed:** 432**Undecided:** 56

Filing Support	Commenter	Source	Comments
	Alice Lockhart	In person	***Comment provided at 8-31-17 public comment hearing***
	Frank Turner	In person	***Comment provided at 8-31-17 public comment hearing***
	Jane Lindley	In person	***Comment provided at 8-31-17 public comment hearing***
	Erika Shriner	In person	***Comment provided at 8-31-17 public comment hearing***
	Roxanne White	In person	***Comment provided at 8-31-17 public comment hearing***
	Michael Laurie	In person	***Comment provided at 8-31-17 public comment hearing***
	Suzanne Greenberg	In person	***Comment provided at 8-31-17 public comment hearing*** ***Customer attended the 7-31-17 Public Comment Hearing***
	Philip Palios	In person	***Comment provided at 8-31-17 public comment hearing***
	Madeline Goodwin	In person	***Customer attended 8-31-17 public comment hearing***
	Joel Carlson	In person	***Comment provided at 8-31-17 public comment hearing***
	Barak Gale	In person	***Comment provided at 8-31-17 public comment hearing***
	Lynne Robinson	In person	***Comment provided at 8-31-17 public comment hearing***
	Lon Freeman	In person	***Comment provided at 8-31-17 public comment hearing***
	Nancy Roberts	In person	***Comment provided at 8-31-17 public comment hearing***
	Carl Flowers	In person	***Comment provided at 8-31-17 public comment hearing***
	Bryndis Danke	In person	***Comment provided at 8-31-17 public comment hearing***
	Kimberly Danke	In person	***Comment provided at 8-31-17 public comment hearing***
	Cynthia Pratt	In person	***Comment provided at 8-31-17 public comment hearing***
	Beth Doglio, WA State Legislature	In person	***Comment provided at 8-31-17 public comment hearing***

**Total Comments:** 495  
**In Favor:** 7  
**Opposed:** 432  
**Undecided:** 56

Filing Support	Commenter	Source	Comments
	Donna Albert	In person	***Comment provided at 8-31-17 public comment hearing***
	Stacy Oaks	In person	***Comment provided at 8-31-17 public comment hearing***
	Lynette Bryon	In person	***Comment provided at 8-31-17 public comment hearing***
	Ron Morrison	In person	***Comment provided at 8-31-17 public comment hearing***
	Paul Wagner	In person	***Comment provided at 8-31-17 public comment hearing***
	James Rideout	In person	***Comment provided at 8-31-17 public comment hearing***
	Mary Paynter	In person	***Comment provided at 8-31-17 public comment hearing***
	Kevin Haughton	In person	***Comment provided at 8-31-17 public comment hearing***
	Secna Steffer	In person	***Comment provided at 8-31-17 public comment hearing***
	Anne Kroeker	In person	<p>***Comment provided at 8-31-17 public comment hearing***</p> <p>+++++</p> <p>***UPDATE</p> <p>September 12, 2017</p> <p>The consumer filed additional comments via email***</p> <p>Regarding PSE’s Rate Hearing Increase Request, Dockets UE-170033 and UG-170034, Comment on Requested Changes to Washington Utilities and Transportation Commission Sept 10, 2017</p> <p>Dear Commissioners,</p> <p>I attended the Puget Sound Energy hearing on August 31st in Olympia, and signed up to speak, but was not able to stay as long as needed to do so to testify, although I greatly appreciated your willingness to stay as long as necessary for others. I am submitting my written statement now instead.</p>

The testimony I heard that night from elected officials, scientists, Native Americans, students and concerned citizens of all ages throughout the affected rate communities, was impressive and focused on various aspects of why PSE should not raise their rates and should get off of fossil fuel sources as soon as possible. They pointed out that PSE should not be subsidized by their customers any longer for use of their Colstrip coal-fired power plant, which was recognized as the country's 3rd (!) worst polluting facility in 2016, or the start-up of the LNG plant in Tacoma. \*See detailed points enumerated at the end of this letter.

To underscore their many arguments about climate change having turned into climate disaster, as our current local and national situation points out all too well, we clearly need to completely transition to renewable energy sources as fast as possible. PSE should be investing in infrastructure and business to further solar and wind energy in Washington, instead of fighting for their continuing use of their coal plant in Montana and asking their customers to subsidize its proposed many year decommission. (During Hurricane Harvey's time on land, the wind turbines kept right on churning, [https://www.commondreams.org/views/2017/09/03/texas-wind-turbines-went-right-turning-under-harveys-impact-refineries-shut-down?](https://www.commondreams.org/views/2017/09/03/texas-wind-turbines-went-right-turning-under-harveys-impact-refineries-shut-down?utm_campaign=shareaholic&utm_medium=facebook&utm_source=socialnetwork)

[utm\\_campaign=shareaholic&utm\\_medium=facebook&utm\\_source=socialnetwork](https://www.commondreams.org/views/2017/09/03/texas-wind-turbines-went-right-turning-under-harveys-impact-refineries-shut-down?utm_campaign=shareaholic&utm_medium=facebook&utm_source=socialnetwork) ).

According to Al Gore's Climate Reality Training presentation, based on peer-reviewed science, the increased carbon released into our land, air and water, costs us higher average temperatures and more weather events leading to increased intensity of floods and mudslides, wildfires, drought, storm damage, ocean acidification, melting glaciers and sea level rise, ecosystem loss, famine, water scarcity, infrastructure loss, infectious diseases and political instability, all leading to mass species extinction and climate refugees. For all these reasons and more, such as the absence of achieving a new economic potential with renewables and a more equitable social environment (<http://www.yesmagazine.org/issues/life-after-oil/what-keeping-oil-in-the-ground-can-do-for-economic-inequality-20160315>), there is every reason in the natural and manmade world to not grant the rate request to PSE, at this time.

In addition to the ongoing and future destruction of our way of life, there is also the fact that PSE, as a for-profit corporation, is in the business to make money for their investors and their employees, and not to serve their customers for the sake of providing utility services or for appropriate costs for those services.

I, and my husband, have had personal recent experience of significant trouble with PSE in these last regards. When we bought a property in their service area a few years ago, we expected to develop it using its decades old easement for power. Instead, PSE charged us many thousands of dollars for all sorts of "required" engineering and upgrades before allowing us continued use of the

easement, prevented us from attaching our solar roof panels to the grid for 2 years, and told us to hire a lawyer. This behavior is not what utility customers should expect. We have been PSE customers since we moved here 36 years ago, first in Bellevue and then in Des Moines, and knew them when they were truly a public entity, interested in fair prices and service to customers and their community, partnering with such great projects as helping to fund the building of the Mercer Slough Environmental Center. We have been deeply disappointed and frustrated with their “new” style. To know that they charge us, and all of their customers, to pay their lawyers and employees to operate for their investors’ benefit, at the expense of providing adequate and appropriate energy and utility services to their customers, rankles even further.

I agree with the State Attorney General Public Counsel’s position regarding the need to prove the costs for decommissioning the Colstrip plant, along with any remediation expenses. I don’t agree that PSE be allowed to start collecting for those perceived costs now, as they do not know what they will be, if any. As to PSE’s request to collect funds in advance of projected increased costs for compliance with the State’s Clean Air Rule and emission reduction requirements, they also may find that those costs do not materialize and so should not have permission to start acquiring for them now.

Moreover, the corporation of Puget Sound Energy owes all of us, its direct customers in its service area and the larger region of our State, reimbursement for the full cost of carbon pollution that they have wreaked on our environment, throughout the years of their feet-dragging to move to a renewable energy resources economy. Given what we know of their business practices not being oriented to the long-term sustainability of their community, I would advocate for PSE to be shutdown as our (for-profit) utility service providers and give their customers back the public serving entity that we used to have and still deserve.

Thank you for your attention throughout this hearing proceeding and listening to our pleas for instituting fair practices providing a healthier economic and sustainable community.

Sincerely,

Anne Kroeker

27915 10th Ave S, Des Moines WA 98198

\*Points made by those at the Rate Hearing in Olympia:

Help King County and other cities like Bellingham meet their goal to transfer to clean power  
Match other utilities in our State investing in renewables (not just through individual customers’

			<p>choice and payment, as PSE's current model does)          Assist, not detract from our State's efforts to reduce our carbon emissions          Eliminating coal input to economy turns into a 47% GHG reduction savings          Air pollutants and other health risks from fossil fuel use          There are social costs of carbon pollution          Next generations need secure and sustainable future          Coastal communities are especially at risk          Need to commit to Climate Adaptation Response          Billions of infrastructure dollars at risk          Fair pricing, not high profit for foreign investors          PSE isn't required to carry the full cost of insuring catastrophic or ongoing pollution events, such as for the new LNG plant in Tacoma</p>
	Laurie Dolan, Washington State Legislature	In person	***Comment provided at 8-31-17 public comment hearing***
	Kim Dobson	In person	***Comment provided at 8-31-17 public comment hearing***
	Nikie Walters	In person	***Comment provided at 8-31-17 public comment hearing***
	Ryan Dewitt	In person	***Comment provided at 8-31-17 public comment hearing***
	D Shaw	In person	***Comment provided at 8-31-17 public comment hearing***
	Nanette Reetz	In person	***Comment provided at 8-31-17 public comment hearing***
	Val Peaphon	In person	***Comment provided at 8-31-17 public comment hearing***
	Pamela Bond	In person	***Comment provided at 8-31-17 public comment hearing***
	Earth-Feather Sovereign	In person	***Comment provided at 8-31-17 public comment hearing*** ***See Attachment - Treaty of Medicine Creek, 1854***
	Zane Smith	In person	***Comment provided at 8-31-17 public comment hearing***
	Julie Minugh	In person	***Comment provided at 8-31-17 public comment hearing***
	Anette Bryan	In person	***Comment provided at 8-31-17 public comment hearing***
	Noel Parrish	In person	***Comment provided at 8-31-17 public comment hearing***
	Carolyn DeFord- Eden	In person	***Comment provided at 8-31-17 public comment hearing***

**Total Comments:** 495**In Favor:** 7**Opposed:** 432**Undecided:** 56

Filing Support	Commenter	Source	Comments
	Carlo Voli	In person	***Comment provided at 8-31-17 public comment hearing***
	Lyle Shawn Conway	In person	***Customer attended the 7-31-17 Public Comment Hearing*** ***Comment provided at 8-31-17 public comment hearing***
	Joanne May Spottedbear	In person	***Comment provided at 8-31-17 public comment hearing***
	Patricia Conway	In person	***Comment provided at 8-31-17 public comment hearing***
	Kathy Lawhon	In person	***Comment provided at 8-31-17 public comment hearing***
	Patricia A. Holm	In person	***Customer attended 8-31-17 public comment hearing***
	Cathy Carrnthers	In person	***Comment provided at 8-31-17 public comment hearing***
	Steven Storms	In person	***Comment provided at 8-31-17 public comment hearing***
	Marilyn Kimmerling	In person	***Comment provided at 8-31-17 public comment hearing***
	LaDonna Robertson	In person	
	Bruce Epeight	In person	***Comment provided at 8-31-17 public comment hearing***
	Linda Baker	In person	***Comment provided at the 7-31-17 Public comment hearing***
	Liam Moser	In person	*** Comment provided at the 7/31/17 Public comment hearing***
	Mark Vossler	In person	***Comment provided at the 7-31-17 Public Comment Hearing***
	Bill Trueit	In person	***Comment provided at the 7-31-17 Public Comment Hearing***
	Rachel Mollox	In person	***Comment provided at the 7-31-17 Public Comment Hearing***

**Total Comments:** 495**In Favor:** 7**Opposed:** 432**Undecided:** 56

Filing Support	Commenter	Source	Comments
	Donna Thompson	In person	***Comment provided at the 7-31-17 Public Comment Hearing***
	Kathryne Daniels	In person	***Comment provided at the 7-31-17 Public Comment Hearing*** ***Customer attended 8-31-17 public comment hearing***
	Steve Rubicz	In person	***Comment provided at the 7-31-17 Public Comment Hearing***
	Bob Dilg	In person	***Comment provided at the 7-31-17 Public Comment Hearing***
	Paula Waters	In person	***Comment provided at the 7-31-17 Public Comment Hearing***
	Pam Snell	In person	***Comment provided at the 7-31-17 Public Comment Hearing***
	Nancy Berry	In person	***Comment provided at the 7-31-17 Public Comment Hearing***
	Margo Roy	In person	***Comment provided at the 7-31-17 Public Comment Hearing***
	Dave Asher	In person	***Comment provided at the 7-31-17 Public Comment Hearing***
	Rich Voget	In person	***Comment provided at the 7-31-17 Public Comment Hearing***
	Fran Brooks	In person	***Comment provided at the 7-31-17 Public Comment Hearing***
	James Adock	In person	*** Comment provided at the 7-31-17 Public Comment Hearing***
	Linda Seltzer	In person	*** Comment provided at the 7-31-17 Public Comment Hearing***
	Earl Gipson	In person	*** Comment provided at the 7-31-17 Public Comment Hearing***
	Debby Jackson	In person	*** Comment provided at the 7-31-17 Public Comment Hearing***
	Sameer Runade	In person	*** Comment provided at the 7-31-17 Public Comment Hearing***
	Nigel Herbig	In person	*** Comment provided at the 7-31-17 Public Comment Hearing***
	Susan Thomas	In person	*** Comment provided at the 7-31-17 Public Comment Hearing***
	Brian Grunkemeyer	In person	*** Comment provided at the 7-31-17 Public Comment Hearing***

**Total Comments:** 495**In Favor:** 7**Opposed:** 432**Undecided:** 56

Filing Support	Commenter	Source	Comments
	Neal Anderson	In person	*** Comment provided at the 7-31-17 Public Comment Hearing***
	Jill Reifschneider	In person	*** Comment provided at the 7-31-17 Public Comment Hearing***
	Rachel Brombaugh Exec. Energy Policy King County	In person	***Comment Provided at the 7-31-17 Public Comment Hearing*** ***Customer is a Specialist at King County Executive Energy and Partnerships***
	Warren Halverson	In person	***Comment Provided at the 7-31-17 Public Comment Hearing***
	Loretta Lopez	In person	***Comment Provided at the 7-31-17 Public Comment Hearing***
	Andrea Lister	In person	***Comment Provided at the 7-31-17 Public Comment Hearing***
	Ana Jamborcic	In person	***Comment Provided at the 7-31-17 Public Comment Hearing***
	Sarah Rizer	In person	***Comment Provided at the 7-31-17 Public Comment Hearing***
	Dakota W Case	In person	***Customer attended the 7-31-17 Public Comment Hearing*** ***Comment provided at 8-31-17 public comment hearing***
	Aaron Tam	In person	***Comment Provided at the 7-31-17 Public Comment Hearing***
	Norm Hanson	In person	***Comment Provided at the 7-31-17 Public Comment Hearing***
	Elizabeth Von Tobel	In person	***Comment Provided at the 7-31-17 Public Comment Hearing***
	Karin Duval	Mail	***See attached letter for customer comment***
	Dawn Gibbs	Mail	***See attached post card for customer comment***
	Carol Zabilaler	Mail	***See attached post card for customer comment***
	Kevin Jones	Mail	***See attached post card for comment***

**Total Comments:** 495**In Favor:** 7**Opposed:** 432**Undecided:** 56

Filing Support	Commenter	Source	Comments
	Portia McGuire	Web	We have solar at our house. And some months we only pay basic charge and it isn't going up very much, it isn't going up much but it is going up 14%, if it was only \$1, but this could be more. But they are talking about a 3.2 % increase, but in my house it would be more than 14% and that seems a little unnecessary.
	Jerry Johnston	Web	This is regarding PSE's additional charges they have tied to coal plant closures. My husband and I have owned our home in Kirkland since 1972. We have to be on a budget to keep up with the maintenance overhead. We currently have free over-the-air television, no internet, and no cell phones; in other words, it is necessary for us to keep our overhead under strict control. The increased costs are hitting us from all sides. For example, however small our last landline telephone bill increased its costs to us which in turn City of Kirkland and state taxes also increased on that bill. However minor, all increases add up. Property taxes are becoming frightful. It was welcome reading in our Kirkland Reporter the Utilities and Transportation Commission's staff recommended to Puget Sound Energy taking a different approach to paying for the decommission of units one and two in the coal plant. Please seriously consider their approach to their recommended rate structure change which would decrease, not increase, electricity rates. We have enjoyed living here with the beauty of trees, ect. and hope to continue affording to do so.
	Jackie Drewes	Web	Puget Sound Energy gets a rate increase every year and the prices for electricity is getting outrageous. I am on a fixed income as is my daughter. We do not get rate increases in our income very often so it makes it very hard to keep having to pay higher prices for electricity on top of all the increased taxes we have to pay. Please do not let them increase our prices again. There are a lot of people out there that cannot afford the rate increases and everyone wonders why there are so many people living on the streets.
	Jon Otto	Web	I am retired on a fixed income; therefore, I strongly object to the proposed electricity rate increase. Considering all tax increases along with other cost of living increases, it's extremely difficult for us on fixed incomes to survive. Thank you for your consideration.

**Total Comments:** 495**In Favor:** 7**Opposed:** 432**Undecided:** 56

Filing Support	Commenter	Source	Comments
	Carol Strommer	Web	<p>Comment via telephone - Susan Clemen</p> <p>I received an increase the first of May, 2017. I don't think another one in December is called for. I am strongly opposed. I am also opposed to the Montana Coal strip generating station They cannot justify collecting expenses and extending their lease for 10 years. Also, paying for expenses as normal doing business including depreciation. They're not justified in increasing our expenses for these either. My rates are higher than proposed rates right now. Something is rotten in Demark. I would like to talk to someone about the rates.</p>
	Suzanne O'Clair	Web	<p>Phone (SC)</p> <p>As a senior every little bit has to come from a fixed income. When everyone is looking for increases and everyone is, it all adds up. I appreciate the service, but I am close but I don't qualify and meet financial assistance requirements. I live in an older home that needs weatherization and am trying to solve that problem. Even with budget billing, due to the weather, sometimes it makes a big a jump in monthly bills. It comes down to a monthly cash flow for your consumers. Please consider all who are elderly or are the working poor in your decision.</p>
	Adrienne Sorenson	Web	<p>I do not support PSE's continued use of coal and other greenhouse gas producing energy sources. This is taking our state in the wrong direction. We should be developing plans to use 100% green and renewable sources.</p>

**Total Comments:** 495**In Favor:** 7**Opposed:** 432**Undecided:** 56

Filing Support	Commenter	Source	Comments
	George Eads	Web	<p>Phone Complaint (SC)</p> <p>My complaint is that PSE is just one of many companies seeking increase in costs. My wife and I are on FIXED incomes, which means we depend on the government COLA which has been zero or next to nothing for the last two years. It has absolutely not been keeping up with inflation. Though it seems like a small increase to PSE, 2.8%. I would like to know where I am going to get the extra money to pay for the increase when our budget already maxed out? The company is only interested in its profits. The company needs to think about the customers retired and on a fixed income and stop increasing the rates.</p>
	Margaret Morin	Web	I can't afford it, I am on a budget plan and I want to be able to stay with my budget.
	Mark Landers	Web	seems the cost per kwh is already highest in the state, the more we conserve the more the rates go up. they want 11.4183cents kwh but for the energy exchange credit they give us .006794 cents kwh.
	R K	Web	<p>Rates are already high in this area and a rate increase places a further burden on families who are barely scraping by as it is. The cost of living here has skyrocketed and our incomes are not keeping up. We earn less than we did 10 years ago (at the same types of jobs - no career changes), and our costs continue to go up. We do not live extravagantly - buy all clothes at places like Target, only vacations are camping, older cars, etc. Our family is not alone in this experience. We were never in debt before, but over the past 3 years we have accumulated credit card debt just for living expenses.</p> <p><b>NO RATE INCREASE!</b></p>
	Daniel Villa	Web	<p>In reference to Dockets UE-170033 &amp; UG-170034</p> <p>Dear UTC Commissioners,</p>

My name is Daniel Villa and I am a resident of Tacoma. I am writing to respectfully request that you deny a rate hike for Puget Sound Energy (PSE) that would allow them to continue operating their Colstrip coal-fired power plant beyond 2025. In fact, I think it should be decommissioned by then and add my voice to the many campaigns calling on its retirement.

As a resident of Tacoma I buy my electricity from Tacoma Power & Utilities (TPU), but I do buy my natural gas for heating from PSE. So I know I won't be directly affected financially by this proposed electricity rate hike. But nonetheless I strenuously oppose the further operation of one of the worst sources of carbon dioxide in the US. We need to shift away from fossil fuels and to green sources of energy like solar and wind. Furthermore, the very coal mine supplying Colstrip is expected to run out of coal by 2024 without further expansion.

I think the ongoing disaster in Texas because of Hurricane Harvey serves to underscore the importance of this issue. Climate scientists agree that the effects of such storms are worsened by human-caused climate change since, among other factors, a warmer atmosphere holds more moisture. I lived in Houston a dozen years ago and happened to be moving away just as a tropical storm hit. The amount of rainfall was incredible and some of the freeways were a dozen feet underwater in places. Luckily a toll highway was unaffected and I was able to leave, but the houses of many friends were flooded. So I can somewhat imagine what it's like there now. Incredibly, Houston has had three 500-year flood events in the past three years.

I just enrolled in a green power program with TPU and am willingly paying more to encourage the deployment of solar and wind farms. I know many of my friends and family in the Northwest who are PSE customers would do the same, but not by any means to subsidize a coal-fired power plant.

While I continue to be a PSE natural gas customer, I hope to buy an electric heat pump instead as I am very displeased with PSE placing 43% of their investment costs for their new LNG facility in Tacoma onto rate payers who, by PSE's own testimony, would only need the peak-shaving capabilities "for a few days that may only occur once every few winters." [Garratt direct testimony] I would much rather see \$300 million dollars invested in conservation measures and green energy infrastructure. I think that would have gone much further than running two ships on LNG, which often comes from fracking.

In closing, I wish to reiterate my opposition to any proposed rate hike for PSE that would allow

			<p>them to continue operating the Colstrip power plant past 2025.</p> <p>Thank you for your time and your service,</p> <p>Daniel Villa</p>
	Pamela Mach	Web	<p>PSE must get out of Colstrip no later than 2025.</p> <p>Reasons: 1) The owner of the Rosebud coal mine predicts that Rosebud will run out of coal in currently mined areas by the end of 2024. If Colstrip operates past 2025, it will likely require an expansion of the mine, which has already destroyed habitat and heavily polluted groundwater. 2) King County’s Strategic Climate Action Plan calls on the county to “phase out coal-fired electricity source by 2025.” The Council has formally adopted the plan, and 14 King County mayors have signed on. King County represents half of PSE’s service territory! 3) King County, city governments, and PSE’s major business customers—such as Microsoft, Starbucks, Target, and REI— are demanding clean, green energy from PSE. Renewable energy should be accessible and affordable for everyone, not just those with deep pockets. All of PSE’s customers deserve carbon-free energy, and that begins with PSE getting out of coal by 2025. 4) 100 percent clean energy – wind, solar and energy efficiency – is not only abundant and affordable; it is also the only long-term solution for fighting climate change. 5)PSE should start planning NOW for getting out of Colstrip by 2025 to enable an orderly and just transition for the community of Colstrip.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
	Phil Brooke	Web	<p>Hi Wa UTC:</p> <p>Please confirm you have received this communication.</p> <p>I'm writing to urge you to DENY both the electric and gas rate increases requested by PSE, and instead decrease rates commensurate to the decrease in wholesale fracked gas and colstrip coal.</p>

Due to the proposed colstrip closure and Tacoma LNG, I have watched PSE up close in the last 2 years. The small army of PSE greenwashers, lobbyists, lawyers, polluters, and frankly, liars, say one thing to citizens and regulators, then do a completely different thing after no one is watching. You need to know their EIS information contradicts what they tell YOU! Who are they lying to?

PSE is creating environmental destruction, then forcing US to pay for it. PSE refuses to retire their colstrip operations, which is one of the single most polluting operations in the United States.

I have watched as citizens request critical information related to their family's safety--PSE sends in a different team of highly paid lawyers at each and every step of the way to fight our requests to protect their families safety. I've watched them blow up businesses, then refuse to pay for the damage they created and the livelihoods they have ruined. I've watched as PSE neglects their infrastructure, so they have unlimited money to spend on sophisticated greenwashing campaign to convince locals LNG is the green wave of the future, when in reality, it's nothing more than natural gas weaponized against Washington citizens.

They can pay for their environmental cleanups, disasters, campaign donations, lawyers, greenwashing, and local, state, and federal lobbyists with their shareholder profits, rather than ratepayer or taxpayer funds.

PSE has a sophisticated gig, and it needs to be stopped. We have granted them a utility monopoly. It needs to get back to being boring, reliable, truthful, and affordable.

Sincerely,

Phil Brooke  
PO Box 294  
Wilkeson, WA 98396  
oldbrickhousefarm@yahoo.com  
253.531.3353

**Total Comments:** 495

**In Favor:** 7

**Opposed:** 432

**Undecided:** 56

Filing Support	Commenter	Source	Comments
	Diana Miner	Web	This is in regards to the rate increase proposed for electric service in December 2017. I am hoping that a complete investigation will take place regarding this increase, that it is an extreme necessity for PSE as this is a hardship financially every time one of these increases takes place. I am a senior on a fixed income and as I said, this would be a definite hardship and a strain on my budget. Thank you for considering the public's opinion.
	Julian Pietras	Web	PSE has had increases over the past 5 years. They continue to have a large profit and high executive salaries. They have not completed necessary equipment upgrades to ensure short power outages. Families cannot pass on increased costs from year to year as prices go up industries should learn to live within reasonable rates not rely on continued increases from year to year.
	Debby Herbert	Web	I am very opposed to PSE's LNG facility. I think it is outrageous that the project is moving ahead despite significant expert evidence that it should not be built in a highly populated area like the Port of Tacoma. It is outdated technology that is being locked in for at least 50 more years. It is an obvious danger in the era of terrorism. And the financial issues; taxpayer subsidized and is the only reason it is financially feasible for PSE. Plus the fact they will come away scot free if there is an accident, another rip-off of the taxpayer. Please stop this project! Thank you.

**Total Comments:** 495**In Favor:** 7**Opposed:** 432**Undecided:** 56

Filing Support	Commenter	Source	Comments
	Laura McGowan	Web	<p>EV -</p> <p>I am 84 years old, and they want to totally put us out of business. I cannot see why there should be rate change. I am looking on my bill this morning, and how dare they (PSE) ask money for a warm home fund.</p> <p>I think the rate increase is stupidity, it's for the stockholders, and customers on limited income are not taken into consideration when increases occur.</p> <p>Why do they need to be assessing rate increases? Especially if the prices of barrels of natural gas are going down. Every year I call in about the rate increases, but this year I am calling with negative attitude towards the increases.</p>
	David Lammi	Web	<p>STOP RAISING RATES... COST OF LIVING IS CRAZY ENOUGH ALREADY!! With property increases and utilities ALWAYS going up... enough is enough already. How about lowering rates!?</p>
	Steven McCoy	Web	<p>It is a financial hardship on me. I am 100% disabled. I cannot work. And it is a substantial increase. About \$89 per month. Our disability income is set, and that is a substantial increase.</p>

**Total Comments:** 495**In Favor:** 7**Opposed:** 432**Undecided:** 56

Filing Support	Commenter	Source	Comments
	Sandra Kissika	Web	<p>Phone (SC)</p> <p>I have called to complain to the company before and was told they are a for profit company. So I remember hearing years ago, that PSE has stock holders located around the world that they pay dividends to, so when we pay our electric bill. PSE makes enough profits to pay dividends to shareholders around the world. What is happening with our economy where more and more people are having to go to the food banks and churches for free meals and it increasing by 100 people per month at the food bank in Blaine. It shows that more and more people are struggling to eat and pay their bills. I myself am living off half of poverty level in order to heat my house, which is electric heat, and would be over \$200 a month to heat in the winter months, which would be about half my income. So because I cannot use my electric much, my house is often 50 degrees. I wear winter clothing, including my winter jacket in the house, which still isn't warm enough and I have to wrap myself in a blanket. So when you talk about paying dividends to shareholders and rich people around the world I am a senior on a fixed income and because of your already inflated rates, I cannot to afford to keep myself or my house warm in the winter. I know of countless of other people in the same boat. I would like to see PSE create a separate department for people who are on welfare or food stamps, or in low income housing to have much lower rates for their electric bills, depending on income. I also am appalled when PSE shuts off electricity because they have not been able to afford to pay their electric bill; it could be a mother with a newborn baby and she has no way to pay her bill and they are shutting her electricity off; it could be a 90 year old woman whose husband just died, has no way of paying her bill and they turn her electricity off in the winter. Money is not honesty, money is not integrity, money is not truth, and if you base all your values on money you have lost your values.</p>

**Total Comments:** 495**In Favor:** 7**Opposed:** 432**Undecided:** 56

Filing Support	Commenter	Source	Comments
	Mary Royal	Web	<p>Comment taken by Consumer Protection, Elizabeth Eskridge 6/6/2017 the caller does not have a computer to make her online comment.</p> <p>Since the disabled and senior population received such a small COLA this year, the private monopoly companies like PSE should take no increase or smaller increase.</p>
	Camelia Chatfield	Web	It's unwarranted.
	Beatriz Longmate	Web	<p>I'm not in favor of the proposed rate increase Puget Sound Energy wants to impose. The Electric bill is already too high as it is, and it's a hardship not only for us who are not working, but for those who are going to retire like my husband. I just stopped working for health reasons. Have worked so hard to make a living, but the government impose so many taxes rates and high prices that is impossible to get ahead. No wonder there are so many people who stop trying and live of the government, it is easier for them, they just stretch their hand, say they are low income, and get everything for free.</p> <p>I oppose the increase. and I hope you listen.</p>
	Marie Dinsmore	Web	<p>The UTC has the authority to approve rates which may be higher or lower than our request. New rates are expected to become effective upon completion of the UTC's 11-month examination of our proposed rates in December 20, 2017</p> <p>I am totally against allowing PSE to raise our power rates again. It is difficult enough to pay my current electric bill at the current rate. I know so many people who live on fixed incomes who also struggle to pay their bills and need assistance to pay their current power bill. The energy assistance has been cut for many who relied on it for help to pay their bills; now they want to raise their rates with the economy still sluggish and people struggling. Please don't let them do this at this time. Wait until the economy picks up some before considering letting them raise our rates again. Thank you for your consideration.</p>

**Total Comments:** 495**In Favor:** 7**Opposed:** 432**Undecided:** 56

Filing Support	Commenter	Source	Comments
	Gloria Linderman	Web	They are offering a discount for those that have natural gas. Unfortunately, in our area, that is NOT an option. There is NO service. We only have the choice of electricity, propane or wood stove. This is NOT fair to our area.
	B. Jenne	Web	PHONE (SH)  Being a senior citizen and all of us are on fixed incomes and I just feel that everything is going up and its hard and I'm against it. I think PSE is great.
	Javier Lopez	Web	I want to be in your meeting. And that's all I want. I think you are dangerous. If you are not listening to me, then there is something wrong.  (Submitted on behalf of the customer by Alice Fiman. The customer then disconnected the line attempting to take another call.)
	Clara Turnbull Murphy	Web	ev -  I am against the rate increase for electric bills going up. I don't know why we are getting another rate increase. We are already having a problem paying our bills. We are lower income customers, (my mother and I) and I don't think it is right that Puget Sound Energy are requiring another rate increase. I think they've raised our rates more than three times a year..
	Daniel Tom	Web	I am a Puget Sound Energy residential customer, and I would like to comment on PSE's rate case that includes partial decommissioning of the Colstrip, Montana coal plant. I request the commission work with PSE to look at ways of accelerating full closure of the Colstrip plant. Climate change is a major concern affecting us all. It is in our best interest to look at all opportunities to reduce emissions as soon as possible.

**Total Comments:** 495**In Favor:** 7**Opposed:** 432**Undecided:** 56

Filing Support	Commenter	Source	Comments
	Dale Walter	Web	PSE has again submitted a request for increasing electric rates. This seems to be an ongoing thing with them. I am opposed to the increase as I understand they are selling power to California. If they can do that, they shouldn't need to raise rates.
	Cheri Smith	Web	I would ask that any rate increases be focused on clean energy and that the company diminish its use of all fossil fuels. I would like to see 100% clean energy going forth in the near future. Thank you.
	Deborah Rudnick	Web	It is not appropriate to use a rate increase to make PSE's customers foot the bill for the continued use of fossil fuels in our energy footprint. I do not agree with a rate increase as long as PSE continues to rely on coal or promotes LNG as a substantive portion of their energy mixture. We should be doing everything in our power to move swiftly and immediately away from fossil fuels. If PSE showed its customers a better commitment to rapid transition, I would be much more willing to pay for rate increases that would support the development of the infrastructure to support renewables.
	James Cozen	Phone	<p>Elizabeth Eskridge for consumer as states he does not have internet access on 6/28/2017 at 3:36 p.m.</p> <p>The customer is using less energy but PSE is increasing his electric bill by \$27 dollars per month. He does not know what the answer is but wants PSE to address the fact that many customers are on fixed incomes and increases are pricing people out of their homes, especially the elderly. The customer says he wants PSE to stop increasing their rates to improve their equipment and increase their employee wages.</p>
	Susan Preston	Web	<p>PHONE/RS</p> <p>I'm against the rate hike. It is not necessary. People have enough financial stress right now.</p>

**Total Comments:** 495**In Favor:** 7**Opposed:** 432**Undecided:** 56

Filing Support	Commenter	Source	Comments
	Joyce Turner	Web	More than 30% of PSE comes from a coal producing plant in Montana, of which they (PSE)' is the largest partner. Coal is the greatest polluter and contributes to carbon. Why do they need an increase when they refuse to clean up their act.? No
	Margo Polley	Web	<p>Submitting again because I failed to add the following: Re: Puget Sound Energy, UE-170033 &amp; UG-170034</p> <p>To the Utilities and Transportation Commission:</p> <p>Thank you for taking my testimony. You have one of the most important decisions before you – to go forward with business as usual and allow climate chaos to grow, or take a stand now for a saner and greener future. I understand that you and PSE are mandated to consider rates and the impact of your actions on rate payers. Let me ask you, what good is a low rate if we can no longer live on this planet due to impacts from climate change?</p> <p>We can no longer invest in fossil fuels, whether it's PSE's Tacoma Liquid Natural Gas plant, their Coal Strip Plant in Montana or any other fossil fuel infrastructure. The only costs PSE should be allowed to pass on to us, the ratepayers, are investments in sustainable energy – wind, solar, or geothermal.</p> <p>Climate change is urgent. Climate change is terrifying. We are not good about articulating the urgency with which we need to change. One reason is because there is a delay of maybe 20 years before we see the effect of current carbon levels. Scientists say that we could keep the planet we were born on if we had stopped carbon from increasing beyond 350ppm. We hit 350ppm in 1988. We are seeing now the effects of 365ppm that we hit 20 years ago in 1997. 365ppm we see floods that covered a third of Pakistan, that cover a third of Bangladesh now; we've seen 5 years of draught in Syria that acted like an accelerant for civil unrest and the breakdown of civil society; we've seen Katrina, Sandy, Harvey, absolutely horrific wildfires that don't behave as they used to, cannot be controlled. You know there's currently a wildfire on the west side of the Cascades, 30</p>

miles from my house? It's small, it's not a threat to me, but it's 74 people working to contain it. Wildfire on the west side of the cascades, practically unheard of. There are another 5 burning in WA, 20 in OR, 20 big ones in BC and dozens of small ones, in 2015 there was something like 700 fires in AK that burned 5 mil acres, an area larger than Connecticut.

Because we won't see the effects of our current 400 ppm for 20 years, you have to use your imagination to understand the irreparable damage we've already done to our planet. Irreparable damage. Apocalyptic damage. Feedback loops are intensifying beyond all climate modeling. The climate apocalypse is coming and we can't begin to articulate the hell that will come with it. Imagine 30million Californians running out of water, and unable to grow the fruit and vegetables that feed our country. Imagine climate refugees from countless places flooding into our state. Imagine wildfires threatening your home in summer and floods in winter. Imagine wars for food and water. We are in crisis and we have to act like it. We have a very short window to create a truly sustainable future. We need the political will to do it, and we are here to help give you that political will. Our very future depends on it.

Sincerely,  
Margo Polley  
PO Box 431  
North Bend, WA

**Total Comments:** 495**In Favor:** 7**Opposed:** 432**Undecided:** 56

Filing Support	Commenter	Source	Comments
	Sandra Kissika	Web	<p>Phone (SC)</p> <p>I have called to complain to the company before and was told they are a for profit company. So I remember hearing years ago, that PSE has stock holders located around the world that they pay dividends to, so when we pay our electric bill. PSE makes enough profits to pay dividends to shareholders around the world. What is happening with our economy where more and more people are having to go to the food banks and churches for free meals and it increasing by 100 people per month at the food bank in Blaine. It shows that more and more people are struggling to eat and pay their bills. I myself am living off half of poverty level in order to heat my house, which is electric heat, and would be over \$200 a month to heat in the winter months, which would be about half my income. So because I cannot use my electric much, my house is often 50 degrees. I wear winter clothing, including my winter jacket in the house, which still isn't warm enough and I have to wrap myself in a blanket. So when you talk about paying dividends to shareholders and rich people around the world I am a senior on a fixed income and because of your already inflated rates, I cannot to afford to keep myself or my house warm in the winter. I know of countless of other people in the same boat. I would like to see PSE create a separate department for people who are on welfare or food stamps, or in low income housing to have much lower rates for their electric bills, depending on income. I also am appalled when PSE shuts off electricity because they have not been able to afford to pay their electric bill; it could be a mother with a newborn baby and she has no way to pay her bill and they are shutting her electricity off; it could be a 90 year old woman whose husband just died, has no way of paying her bill and they turn her electricity off in the winter. Money is not honesty, money is not integrity, money is not truth, and if you base all your values on money you have lost your values.</p>

**Total Comments:** 495**In Favor:** 7**Opposed:** 432**Undecided:** 56

Filing Support	Commenter	Source	Comments
	Wendy Knoph	Web	<p>EV -</p> <p>Increases to replace underground cable. Why? This shouldn't apply to our area. Our cable is not underground, it is above ground. When it snows and when the wind blows hard the power outages are due to the cables being above ground.</p> <p>Power is getting so unaffordable. We have no choice to choose other power companies. In addition, we are low income. I am forced to use energy assistance when I really don't have to.</p> <p>Puget Sound Energy takes a lot fun out of life. The bills are much too high.</p>
	Michael Docker	Web	<p>I recently received a letter in the mail from the UATC case number 170033. This letter was to inform me of an opportunity to take a full day off work, with no pay. To come and make a comment during a public hearing. Where everyone on the other side of the table will be getting paid for their time. Its insulting to have Washington state employees, whose wages I provide for. Get in bed with the private utility (PSE etc.)and represent everyone but the people. I'm tired of being bent over and pumped full of glue. There are some in this state that enjoy that sort of thing but not me. It wamps being at the mercy of self centered, self serving people.</p>

**Total Comments:** 495**In Favor:** 7**Opposed:** 432**Undecided:** 56

Filing Support	Commenter	Source	Comments
	Eric Willacker	Web	I am strongly against the proposed rate increase by PSE! PSE is a multi-billion dollar company whose CEO makes millions of dollars a year between salary and bonuses. It is ridiculous that they believe they need more money! Their costs of doing business are just that, THEIR costs and should not be passed on to the customers, especially customers who have NO other choice of energy providers. They know that they will need to replace/repair infrastructure when they install it, and should plan accordingly, and not expect the customers to pay for it. I'm a disabled person, living on a fixed income who already struggles to pay my power bill during the winter, they are a multi-billion dollar company; who do you think can more afford to cover their costs? Please vote no on their proposed rate increase, they already over charge because they have to send a set percent of profit to the holding company that owns them.
	Pat Villa	Web	Dear commissioners, I do not want PSE to be able to increase their rates. I do not support the continued use of the coal plant in Montana. We, as a state and as a country, need to shift away from fossil fuels. I wouldn't mind paying a bit more if I knew the energy used was from renewable sources. Thank you, Pat
	Dwight Rousu	Web	1. The 14% increase in the basic charge for electricity seems excessive and I see no reason for it. Why should I pay 14% more even if I am not using PSE electricity? 2. I see no reason for 6.9% increase in basic charge for gas. 3. I see no proposal for going 100% renewable energy, which should be the top priority for the planet. We are on the planet. There is no planet B.

**Total Comments:** 495**In Favor:** 7**Opposed:** 432**Undecided:** 56

Filing Support	Commenter	Source	Comments
	Beatrice Coleman	Web	My heating elements, I have the kind of heat that's built into the house and into the walls so I have no access to it, my heating elements all malfunctioned in November 2016. Yet, it appears that I consumed more electricity from November to beginning of April than I did when they (heating elements) worked so effectively from November to March 2016-2017. I had no heat but I was charged double what I had when I had heat. I think they could use some analysis. Some cost analysis and financial analysis to stop overcharging people who are poor or on a fixed income rather than double charging or asking for higher rates. I don't think they're using their money wisely. I request an analysis of their system to find out why they don't have the money to do what they're wanting to do. On a blog this winter, I made a comment about the cost of PSE rates. Over 50 people in Thurston county responded and said they had the same experience I did.
	John Ficalora	Web	Puget Sound should not be allowed to capture more profit from their customers while doing everything possible to reduce payment back to solar panel operators in their jurisdiction. The bill that allowed Washington state manufactured solar panels on homes seemed to guarantee 54 cents per kilowatt hour and PSE had the opportunity to guarantee that for individuals prior to reaching an arbitrary cap on production. PSE instead opted to reduce payments for established solar panel operators and dilute the payback for any new solar panels installed. This effectively cheats solar panel installers while PSE expects to have a rate increase to increase their profits. This is unacceptable and this is why I strongly suggest we do not increase their profits unless solar panels operators also have increased payback for the capital equipment that is being used by PSE.

**Total Comments:** 495**In Favor:** 7**Opposed:** 432**Undecided:** 56

Filing Support	Commenter	Source	Comments
	Lewis Dey	Web	<p>RE: Docket UE-170033 - We do not understand why PSE is requesting another Electric Service rate hike. It cannot be due to inflation as the 2016 Inflation Rate Average is 1.26% per the US Government. Additionally, the US Energy Information Administration projects the following energy variables:</p> <p>"Overall U.S. energy consumption remains relatively flat, rising 5% from the 2016 level by 2040 and somewhat close to its previous peak."</p> <p>"Petroleum consumption remains relatively flat as increases in energy efficiency offset growth in the transportation and industrial activity measures."</p> <p>"Coal consumption decreases as coal loses market share to natural gas and renewable generation in the electric power sector."</p> <p>"On a percentage basis, renewable energy grows the fastest because capital costs fall with increased penetration and because current state and federal policies encourage its use."</p> <p>If the US Government believes that the US energy consumption will be flat, only rising 5% from the 2016 level by 2040, the rate hike hardly seems reasonable!!!!!!</p>
	Eduardo Gary Pina	Web	<p>Ever since Puget Sound Energy was bought out our electric rates have gone up almost 50%. Oil costs less, natural gas costs less, solar panels are more efficient and the prices have dropped, river water powering dams doesn't cost anymore so why raise rates? I am 100% electric so a reduction in natural gas doesn't help me one bit! JUST SAY NO to the electricity hike!</p>

**Total Comments:** 495**In Favor:** 7**Opposed:** 432**Undecided:** 56

Filing Support	Commenter	Source	Comments
	Ronald Wavra	Web	<p>I have been a customer of PSE for years. Every year my rates seem to be climbing and I haven't changed anything or consume any more power then I have when I first moved into the home i am at. When i first moved in this home my rate was at \$80.00 Now after 2 years my rate has gone up to \$206.00 and I am on a budget payment plan. How is it that PSE can keep raising its rates when I am on a fixed income and have a family to raise. I do not accept or propose a rate increase as it will hurt my family.</p> <p>Sincerely</p> <p>Ronald J Wavra</p>
	Barbara N Reinhart	Web	No more increases. People everywhere are saying "one more increase and their homeless". People want more money cause their rent, mortgages, and taxes are going up. Cannot wait for the rental and mortgage cap initiative, I will be apart of it.
	Robert Morgenthaler	Web	can not afford the last rate increase.natural gas is not available at our location.
	F Aglow	Web	<p>To the Washington state Utilities and Transportation Commission,</p> <p>I am writing to you UTC commissioners to advocate for PSE to pay off and close the remaining 2 coal-fired units in Colstrip, Montana, by the year 2025.</p> <p>Not only am I a citizen concerned about the utility's choice of energy sources, i.e. coal, I am also a ratepayer and customer of PSE—so I expect PSE to be doing its bit to support its climate commitments. I do not want to be supporting PSE’s dirty Colstrip coal plant—the third largest climate polluter in the United States.</p>

By contrast, I am happy to see such commitments away from coal to renewable, clean energy from our county, King County, and from such companies as Microsoft, Starbucks, Target, and REI. In turn, I believe PSE should be doing its part as a regional utility—leading the charge in upholding energy alternatives that better the world rather than risking the health, lives and livelihoods of our neighbors and our children.

Taking such steps—whether you are a utility, an institution, or an individual citizen -- means doing your part as a civic leader.

When we look at the devastation wrought by Hurricane Harvey—a hurricane made more dangerous and deadly because of the warmer sea waters partly caused by climate change, we are immediately appalled and chastened. Harvey is just one more symptom of the manmade climate risks we are causing, that are adding to hot summers, hotter and more intense wildfires, higher rainfall and flood events, and sea level rise.

All this has to stop. As a society we have to do everything we can to prevent more disastrous Hurricane Harveys. As citizens, companies, and public officials, we need to change the course of our energy choices. That calls for decisive action and creative leadership.

As our utilities leaders, please guarantee that PSE be divested from Colstrip coal by 2025—for the health and safety of our cities and towns, our children and our future. Thanks for doing what you can in this regard, to push for bold, decisive leadership in combating climate change.

Sincerely,  
F. Aglow

CONSUMER FILED ADDITIONAL COMMENTS VIA EMAIL  
September 1, 2017 - 12:51 p.m.

To the Washington Utilities and Transportation Commission,

Yesterday I made the attached comment to your commissioners regarding PSE's requested rate

increase.

Please add the following to my suggestions:

Besides retiring the two Colstrip Montana coal units and replacing them, I'd like to ask the following:

--I'd like a firm timeline for retiring the 3rd and 4th Colstrip units by 2025 AND a decision to replace units 100% with efficiency increases and renewable sources.

--Rather than simply switching to natural gas, we need to switch to efficiency and renewables. By turning to Colstrip, we are in a sense exporting our energy pollution to the town of Colstrip and the farmers and ranchers of the surrounding area. Fracked gas is minimally better with leaked methane a much more potent greenhouse gas than CO2 and fracking spoiling the water of communities around the well.

--Switch to solar and wind. Montana has lots of sun and wind. The displaced workers from the Colstrip plant need jobs. Why is PSE not investing in wind and solar in Montana?

Thanks for hearing me out!

Sincerely

F. Aglow

**Total Comments:** 495**In Favor:** 7**Opposed:** 432**Undecided:** 56

Filing Support	Commenter	Source	Comments
	Debra Dicaprio	Web	Customers are being overcharged. A tenant took billing out of their name on June 30, 2017. I received a bill for 6/30/17 to 7/19/17 for 19 days of service. There was no gas used, so the bill was for a basic charge plus tax. Then I received a second bill for 7/19/17 to 7/31/19 for 12 days of service. Again, with no gas used, I was billed for a basic charge plus tax. The bill states that the basic charge "per month" is \$10.29 plus \$.69 in tax. Therefore, I was billed twice during the month of July for the monthly basic charge. For 31 days, I paid in two billings the amount of \$ 21.96 which is twice the "per month" charge. This means that the ex-tenant paid \$10.98 for half a month in June and the new tenants will pay \$10.98 twice in the month of August. This is overcharging the customers when no gas has been used for a basic charge "per month" (as shown on my bills). So the basic charge "per month" as stated on the billing is not followed. It is not prorated but collected as many times as someone is billed for that property. The basic charge "per month" as stated on the billing is not followed. It is not prorated but collected as many times as someone is billed for that property during one month. This means that if the billing was to change to my name, as owner, from a previous tenant and then changed to the next tenant two days later, Puget Sound Energy would have collected that monthly basic charge three or possibly four times depending on which dates the changes occurred. This is totally wrong. This basic charge "per month" needs to be prorated for the days in the billing, not per billing.
	Portia McGuire	Web	We have solar at our house. And some months we only pay basic charge and it isn't going up very much, it isn't going up much but it is going up 14%, if it was only \$1, but this could be more. But they are talking about a 3.2 % increase, but in my house it would be more than 14% and that seems a little unnecessary.

**Total Comments:** 495**In Favor:** 7**Opposed:** 432**Undecided:** 56

Filing Support	Commenter	Source	Comments
	Patty Hill	Web	It seems like they go from wanting an increase in natural gas one year, then next year it's the electric customers (of which I am one) that have to pay more. When none of the wages for normal average working customers is increasing, it's not right that all of our utilities keep going up and I'm tired of it. I realize we can use less electricity, but our whole house is electric and we're in an area that does not offer natural gas and no one wants to put into our neighborhood. Why are we being penalized for what's going on at Montana Colstrip Generating Stating and if their poles, conduits and transformers are depreciating, why should we as the public have to pay for this too? Why increased expenses for a "proposed reliability program", doesn't proposed mean something in the works and unless they actually bring it to fruition, why should we pay more? I just don't understand why we have to continue to get charged higher rates on our power bills when they seem high already. Would be nice to have someone stand up for us and say enough is enough.
	Steven McCoy	Web	It is a financial hardship on me. I am 100% disabled. I cannot work. And it is a substantial increase. About \$89 per month. Our disability income is set, and that is a substantial increase.
	Donald Wight	Web	ONCE AGAIN YOU ARE SEPARATING RURAL CUSTOMERS FROM CITY CUSTOMERS. RURAL CUSTOMERS DEPEND ON ELECTRICITY MORE BECAUSE WE DO NOT HAVE NATURAL GAS FACILITIES : SMALL FARMS, LIVESTOCK, FOOD PRODUCTION, WELL PUMPS, SEWAGE DISPOSAL, MANY THINGS WE HAVE TO USE ELECTRICITY TO OPERATE VERSUS THE CITY CONSUMER. WE WHO LIVE IN A RURAL SETTING ARE BEING ASKED TO SUBSIDIZE THE CITY RESIDENTS.
	Phi Le	Web	I do not want PSE to raise our energy bills to fund their fossil fuels infrastructure.

**Total Comments:** 495

**In Favor:** 7

**Opposed:** 432

**Undecided:** 56

Filing Support	Commenter	Source	Comments
	Stephanie Meehan	Web	I am against the proposal for the rate increase. Every year there are several requests and I have been against all of them. I feel they just try to pass on their costs to the regular consumer and they can learn to live within their means like the average citizen has to. Some years you just may have smaller profits.
	Don Wile	Web	I am so tired of this monopoly utility continually asking for price increases to it's customers. My wife and I are 78 years old and on a limited income. We do not qualify for the senior discount because our income is above the limits Puget Sound Energy lists. Our electric and gas costs seem to go up continually. I feel the primary reason they are now asking for this exorbitant increase on both of these sources of energy are to allow them to pay off the \$1.5M fine from their causing the Greenwood explosion on March 9, 2016 for which they were found responsible in March of this year. Please do not approve these increases to occur! Thank you for your consideration.
	Timothy Berglund	Web	Comments taken by Elizabeth Eskridge 6/60/2017 10:24 a.m. because the customer says he cannot use internet, only has telephone internet and hard to use.  The customer says the cost of living including healthcare is going up and in a society geared for profit, everything just keeps going up. He says the infrastructure upgrades may be improved upon but should not come from customer base. Get the money somewhere else. The customer believes the company should explore possibilities with hemp and give a break to growers who use their power.

**Total Comments:** 495**In Favor:** 7**Opposed:** 432**Undecided:** 56

Filing Support	Commenter	Source	Comments
	Carol	Web	PSE has continued to poorly maintain their equipment and lines that has resulted in power outages for the city of Kenmore that goes beyond any normal storm related factors. PSE does not keep their promise to customers to provide reliable service 24 hours a day. I have had my power go out on nice, windless, sunny days. Power outages have lasted up to 3-4 days, which results in loss of food and access to internet, on top of the normal no lights or heat. I have been paying way too much the last 7 years in Kenmore. Why should I have to pay for the cost of upgrading aging electric lines, when PSE has not used the current fees to cover any upgrades and maintaining service equipment?
	Beatriz Longmate	Web	I'm not in favor of the proposed rate increase Puget Sound Energy wants to impose. The Electric bill is already too high as it is, and it's a hardship not only for us who are not working, but for those who are going to retire like my husband. I just stopped working for health reasons. Have worked so hard to make a living, but the government impose so many taxes rates and high prices that is impossible to get ahead. No wonder there are so many people who stop trying and live of the government, it is easier for them, they just stretch their hand, say they are low income, and get everything for free. I oppose the increase. and I hope you listen.
	Sylvia Ann Cortinas	Web	Phone(SC)  No increase for low income people.
	Dean Atkins	Web	I object to the rate hike. The costs for electrical service are already high enough. The rate increases come too often and I shouldn't have to decide whether I have to sit in the dark or feed my kids. I do all I can to monitor our electrical consumption but no matter what we do, it still costs us more inevitably.

**Total Comments:** 495**In Favor:** 7**Opposed:** 432**Undecided:** 56

Filing Support	Commenter	Source	Comments
	Charles Smoyer	Web	<p>Hold the rates steady. No 2% increase. Keep coal operations open in MT, because this keep our rates cheap. I don't care about the environment, clear air is good but cheaper power is better. I want low rates. Cost too much for environment regulation. Keep the rates the same.</p> <p>By phone 8/30/17. MS</p>
	Steven McCoy	Web	It is a financial hardship on me. I am 100% disabled. I cannot work. And it is a substantial increase. About \$89 per month. Our disability income is set, and that is a substantial increase.
	Karin Kraft	Web	Why must the customer absorb all of the costs related to owning a power company? If this were a non-profit company, it would make sense.
	Jackie Drewes	Web	Puget Sound Energy gets a rate increase every year and the prices for electricity is getting outrageous. I am on a fixed income as is my daughter. We do not get rate increases in our income very often so it makes it very hard to keep having to pay higher prices for electricity on top of all the increased taxes we have to pay. Please do not let them increase our prices again. There are a lot of people out there that cannot afford the rate increases and everyone wonders why there are so many people living on the streets.
	John Carlton	Web	<p>No to increase. It is important that they pay for any damages out of their profits and not raising rates to pay for them.</p> <p>Taken by phone on 8/31/17, MS.</p>

**Total Comments:** 495**In Favor:** 7**Opposed:** 432**Undecided:** 56

Filing Support	Commenter	Source	Comments
	Nancy Lopez	Web	<p>Taken complaint for customer who has no internet by Elizabeth Eskridge on 6/13/2017 at 10:43 a.m.</p> <p>The customer says the company over pads the bill with basic charges and delivery fees besides just the cost of gas and electricity. The customer believes both are too high and does not believe the company needs a rate increase for the electric. The customer is a senior citizen who understands inflation but thinks the rate increase for electric is unreasonable. The company is taking the increase in electric to make up for the decrease in gas.</p>
	Luanne Lemmer	Web	In the light of current research about the threat of climate change, I feel our utilities should be moving quickly towards eliminating power production from coal and switching over to renewable resources.
	Joyce Turner	Web	More than 30% of PSE comes from a coal producing plant in Montana, of which they (PSE)' is the largest partner. Coal is the greatest polluter and contributes to carbon. Why do they need an increase when they refuse to clean up their act.? No
	Donald Wight	Web	ONCE AGAIN YOU ARE SEPARATING RURAL CUSTOMERS FROM CITY CUSTOMERS. RURAL CUSTOMERS DEPEND ON ELECTRICITY MORE BECAUSE WE DO NOT HAVE NATURAL GAS FACILITIES : SMALL FARMS, LIVESTOCK, FOOD PRODUCTION, WELL PUMPS, SEWAGE DISPOSAL, MANY THINGS WE HAVE TO USE ELECTRICITY TO OPERATE VERSUS THE CITY CONSUMER. WE WHO LIVE IN A RURAL SETTING ARE BEING ASKED TO SUBSIDIZE THE CITY RESIDENTS.

**Total Comments:** 495**In Favor:** 7**Opposed:** 432**Undecided:** 56

Filing Support	Commenter	Source	Comments
	LAWRENCE D BRAUN	Web	<p>PSE's justifications for this rate increase appear to be capital improvements to increase revenue (profits). As PSE is a privately owned,for profit company, I feel the owners should pay for all improvements that will increase those profits. It's unfair that I should have to pay for improvements and all I get is a higher utility bill, while the owners get new equipment without having to foot any of the cost. If the owners want to increase revenue, let them invest their money to do so.</p> <p>Re:UE-170033</p>
	Margo Polley	Web	<p>August 31, 2017</p> <p>To the Utilities and Transportation Commission:</p> <p>Thank you for taking my testimony. You have one of the most important decisions before you – to go forward with business as usual and allow climate chaos to grow, or take a stand now for a saner and greener future. I understand that you and PSE are mandated to consider rates and the impact of your actions on rate payers. Let me ask you, what good is a low rate if we can no longer live on this planet due to impacts from climate change? We can no longer invest in fossil fuels, whether it's PSE's Tacoma Liquid Natural Gas plant, their Coal Strip Plant in Montana or any other fossil fuel infrastructure. The only costs PSE should be allowed to pass on to us, the ratepayers, are investments in sustainable energy – wind, solar, or geothermal.</p> <p>Climate change is urgent. Climate change is terrifying. We are not good about articulating the urgency with which we need to change. One reason is because there is a delay of maybe 20 years before we see the effect of current carbon levels. Scientists say that we could keep the planet we were born on if we had stopped carbon from increasing beyond 350ppm. We hit 350ppm in 1988. We are seeing now the effects of 365ppm that we hit 20 years ago in 1997. 365ppm we see floods that covered a third of Pakistan, that cover a third of Bangladesh now; we've seen 5 years of</p>

			<p>draught in Syria that acted like an accelerant for civil unrest and the breakdown of civil society; we've seen Katrina, Sandy, Harvey, absolutely horrific wildfires that don't behave as they used to, cannot be controlled. You know there's currently a wildfire on the west side of the Cascades, 30 miles from my house? It's small, it's not a threat to me, but it's 74 people working to contain it. Wildfire on the west side of the cascades, practically unheard of. There are another 5 burning in WA, 20 in OR, 20 big ones in BC and dozens of small ones, in 2015 there was something like 700 fires in AK that burned 5 mil acres, an area larger than Connecticut.</p> <p>Because we won't see the effects of our current 400 ppm for 20 years, you have to use your imagination to understand the irreparable damage we've already done to our planet. Irreparable damage. Apocalyptic damage. Feedback loops are intensifying beyond all climate modeling. The climate apocalypse is coming and we can't begin to articulate the hell that will come with it. Imagine 30million Californians running out of water, and unable to grow the fruit and vegetables that feed our country. Imagine climate refugees from countless places flooding into our state. Imagine wildfires threatening your home in summer and floods in winter. Imagine wars for food and water. We are in crisis and we have to act like it. We have a very short window to create a truly sustainable future. We need the political will to do it, and we are here to help give you that political will. Our very future depends on it.</p> <p>Sincerely,  Margo Polley  PO Box 431  North Bend, WA</p>
	Kevin Billington	Web	<p>In reference to Dockets UE-170033 and UG-170034, I would like to submit the following comments. In general, the reasons given by PSE for the requested rate increases are due to increased expenses and depreciation of assets. There is nothing unique about this, everyone faces increasing expenses and depreciation of assets. Why doesn't PSE do what everyone else has to do when faced with these problems? Find ways of reducing expenses elsewhere to make ends meet. In comparison, if I'm not being thrifty with my money, should my employer be required to pay me more? I think the requested rate increases are unjustified. Thank you for allowing me to comment.</p>

**Total Comments:** 495**In Favor:** 7**Opposed:** 432**Undecided:** 56

Filing Support	Commenter	Source	Comments
	James Haas	Web	I live in low income Senior housing. There is 70+ units in our 5 story building. Each unit has a separate electric bill which is the only utility bill us seniors must pay. My big complaint is the higher proposed basic charge. This charge amounts to 20 - 30% of the total bill. In todays computerization the allows ebills and epayments this basic charge needs to be cut in half. The way this base charge is computed needs to be revised. Low income seniors should NOT pay the same amount as someone who is a high electric user.
	Dianne Short	Web	Rate increase PSE:  Taken by Elizabeth Eskridge for the customer 6/9/2017 at 2:41 p.m. because customer does not have access to internet.  The customer is a senior citizen on a limited income and does not think it is necessary to increase the costs for consumers for fixes the company needs for its own system. The funds should come out of their profits with no rate increase passed to the customer.
	Spero Rockas	Web	My concern is the increase on the Basic charge for Natural Gas UG-170034 & Electrical service UE-170033. The Basic charge should not be increased but reduced to \$7.00 for Electricity and \$10.00 for National Gas. The customer pays for what they use if they are saving by using less they shouldn't be charged more.  Spero G. Rockas

**Total Comments:** 495**In Favor:** 7**Opposed:** 432**Undecided:** 56

Filing Support	Commenter	Source	Comments
	Mervyn Montacute	Web	I am a PSE customer. I do not wish for PSE's use of dirty fossil fuels to be funded by ratepayers. PSE loves to present itself as a 'green' utility. It needs to walk the talk. It should have a specific plan to wean itself off both coal and gas in the shortest possible time. If City Light can do it, then PSE should be able to do it too. Thank you. Mervyn Montacute
	Julian Pietras	Web	PSE has had increases over the past 5 years. They continue to have a large profit and high executive salaries. They have not completed necessary equipment upgrades to ensure short power outages. Families cannot pass on increased costs from year to year as prices go up industries should learn to live within reasonable rates not rely on continued increases from year to year.
	Ruslan Sorochuk	Web	Dockets UE-170033 and UG-170033 Does PSE have some evidence that they cannot afford those 'Improvements' they want to do with their current budget? Some improvements are not even really necessary, as replacing poles in the capitol (which I never even visit). I pay about \$40 just for gas, in middle of summer, and I would not even turn on furnace. I would just use stove to cook food sometimes. I am against those basic charges to go up, especially. This is because they are already too much, and I get my bill up to \$200 at winter while trying to conserve, while its always cold in my house. Those basic charges will be there either way, even though I would try to not use gas/electric at all, or use it at the minimum. If the prices have to go up, than make the actual usage to be going up, especially residences who use more than certain amount (more than average) amount of energy/heat. Jacking prices up for families that already barely afford the current bill, while trying to avoid using energy/gas as much as possible, is absurd. Thank you.

**Total Comments:** 495**In Favor:** 7**Opposed:** 432**Undecided:** 56

Filing Support	Commenter	Source	Comments
	paul vlastelica	Web	How can you allow PS to increase electrical rates at 2.5% when the rate of inflation is much lower than that. Replacing aging underground cable and upgrade should have been built into the system years ago. Same with expenses in electrical poles, conduits and transformers. Where is the saving accounts for these replacements been all these years? Social Security increase was not 2.5%! My pension increase was only 1.6%. How about denying this increase and telling PSE to start living within there means and using consumers as a bottomless pit of money for them. Enough is enough. Tell them no increase in rates and manage their money better
	Richard Vaughn	Web	Regarding UG-170034 (natural gas rates starting Dec 2017). Please do NOT allow Puget Sound Energy to increase the Basic Charge as part of the proposed rate changes. Instead, REDUCE THE BASIC CHARGE (or keep it unchanged), and maintain (or reduce by less) the incremental Therm Charge. Lower base costs and higher incremental rates based on natural gas consumption would (1) encourage lower energy usage and carbon emissions, and (2) maintain necessary funds for the utility.  Thank you.
	Laurence Stockton	Web	I am in support of requiring PSE to close and decommission all phases of the Coalstrip electricity generating plan by 2025. Global warming is real and we need to stop making the problem worse by burning coal to make electricity. I favor the UTC staff proposal submitted in June 2017 to fund closing Phases 1 and 2 by 2022 and would support a similar staff recommendation for closing the final phases of the Coalstrip plant by 2022.
	Katherine Sutherland	Web	I don't want to see more coal plants or to continue burning it at currently open plants. I hope you reject PSEs proposal and rather, demand they move towards renewable energy.

**Total Comments:** 495**In Favor:** 7**Opposed:** 432**Undecided:** 56

Filing Support	Commenter	Source	Comments
	Stephanie Smith	Web	Puget Sound Energy should not get a rate increase. They have had record fines and caused harm to people and businesses without accepting liability. PSE's parent company Macquarie is said to be in the process of looking to sell their stake in PSE based on the results of the rate increase according to Bloomberg. The companies LNG plant in Tacoma has been contracted to be built by a company that is under investigation by the SEC and also falsifying safety records. They are looking for rate payers to pay for their poor decisions. Don't put the burden of their mismanagement on their customers.
	BJ Closner	Web	I just read has been a request for our rates to go up again. We cannot afford yet another increase in rates. Every month we are using less energy than we did the year before, yet out rates keep increasing.  Please remember we are working people out here, who are being bombarded on all sides, by increases in everything, and cannot afford to have yet more taken from us.
	Joan	Web	I would like you to consider alternative methods to increase reliability or to meet any future needs for electricity. We should be working to minimize costs to us— looking at the best alternatives for us and not for what is best for PSE and its Australian and Canadian owners. PSE claims we need this costly project to increase reliability of energy at peak demands. Yet, there are cheaper and more environmentally friendly ways to increase reliability. For example, battery storage is now being used in Southern California to avoid rolling blackouts. Energy consumption has fallen in Bellevue by 5.7 percent from 2011-2015 due to gains in energy efficiency and new smart technology. The trend is to reduce our reliance on the grid, using solar panels and co-generation of power.

**Total Comments:** 495**In Favor:** 7**Opposed:** 432**Undecided:** 56

Filing Support	Commenter	Source	Comments
	Sharon Schultz	Web	Phone (SC) I would prefer the rate increase not be so high or split the difference and lowering of the gas rate and the increase of the electric rate. Those of us living in the country pay higher rates but I'm not sure why. I live alone and have wood heat and my bill for one light, TV, fridge, and my hot water tank runs \$300 a month in the winter. I make \$650 a month and a raise to my utility bill would be catastrophic. Please don't raise the electric rates or offer a senior citizen discount.
	Marjorie McCoid	Web	Puget Sound Energy needs to be responsible and pay for all of the environmental disasters they create, including coal mine clean-ups, neighborhoods they explode through their negligence, and liquid natural gas super hazards in Tacoma.
	Carol Kindt	Web	I am totally opposed to PSE's request for a rate increase. PSE is an Australian company that is destroying the environment and potentially destroying the Port of Tacoma with its plans to build a Liquid Natural Gas storage tank on the shores of Puget Sound, on land directly adjacent to the tribal lands of the Puyallup tribe. If this fracked gas storage facility is built, it has the potential to blow up a two to three mile area surrounding the port location. Any rate increase, which its customers will bear the responsibility for paying, will further PSE's plans to continue to build this facility, which will be used primarily to supply tankers, and the liquid natural gas will not be used by the utility's customer base for heating or any other purpose. To approve the rate increase is to have this region pay for a massive economic boon to PSE for a service which has nothing to do with its customers. This is a travesty. You may publish my comment. I strongly oppose any rate increase proposed by PSE.
	Shaun Hubbard	Web	I am writing as a resident of the Evergreen State. I would like us to live up to our name -- and our promises to reduce greenhouse gas emissions -- by shutting down Colstrip, the 3rd largest climate polluter in the US, by 2025 (not the proposed 2035 timeframe). Thank you.

**Total Comments:** 495**In Favor:** 7**Opposed:** 432**Undecided:** 56

Filing Support	Commenter	Source	Comments
	Robin Heath	Web	I can not even catch up on last increase. always paid bills on time now dividing. we Have no natural gas here and only one hot water on propane you are literally killing me. with stress. I have hurt myself really bad just cause I did not want to put light on. put an end to increases or share with gas customers who can save. PLEASE
	Dean R Davies	Web	Discourage by seeing increase bills in the middle of winter when bills are high anyway. Increase will be a hardship on many people.
	Nicolas Bright	Web	I do not support PSE raising our rates unless they are going full renewables - no coal or gas  Nick
	Syliva Scheurman	Web	I am a senior citizen and these increase on electric rates add up to a \$13 per month increase for service. That is outrages. I and many others are on a fix income with no increase to match requested increase. I assume that they need some money, so I'm not totally against a small one. If they get this rate increase, everyone should go out an pay stock in Avista.
	Janis Bunch	Web	I am writing to oppose PSE's proposed rate change (increase). They just increased their rates last year and many people have had trouble fitting that into their budgets. Please consider the plight of low-income and elderly folks and reject their request.
	Paula Bowden	Web	I'm against the proposed rate increase PSE is requesting. At this time, for many families, economic recovery is still lagging. My job is minimum wage and it is difficult enough to make ends meet. The requested increase may seem small to a few, but for many including my family, it is impossible. It is June and I've just caught up on my April bill and am maintaining electricity by setting up payment arrangements. An added thought is that many in this area don't have natural gas. We are all electric. So the decrease in natural gas rates has no bearing and does not help many subscribers who are all electric customers already.

**Total Comments:** 495**In Favor:** 7**Opposed:** 432**Undecided:** 56

Filing Support	Commenter	Source	Comments
	Kathleen Hewitt	Web	<p>I was at the hearing tonight but decided to leave my comments here after seeing the long list of speakers. I live in Tacoma and am a PSE rate payer. I stand today strongly against the tax rate.</p> <p>I cannot support something that is so detrimental to our environment. In terms of coal use, we must follow the Paris Climate Agreement and comply no later than 2025. There is no good reason to expand mining of coal. Coal is a fuel of the past.</p> <p>Of personal interest to me is PSE's LNG plant in Tacoma. The LNG plant stands against everything I know and believe about global warming. We have been told the plant will use about 50% fracked gas. Scientist in the field will tell you that the life cycle of fracking is every bit as bad as coal in terms of global warming. LNG and coal is not the answer. What we do here in the state of Washington, effects not just the citizens of Washington. The ripple effect includes all living creatures, every drop of water, every molecule in our atmosphere, every handful of dirt. We have to start thinking globally.</p> <p>If you allow the tax rate increase, you'll be encouraging global warming and its consequences by giving PSE the "go ahead" to continue the use of dirty fossil fuels. Denying PSE the tax rate increase will support how most people feel about fossil fuel use. It will send a clear message to PSE that they need to stop what they are doing and move toward a future of safe, clean renewable resources for our energy needs. The decision for a PSE rate hike should be based on ethics, not political or professional. I don't want to be paying for something that will harm my two grandsons and their children's children. They deserve better. Please help put an end to fossil fuel emissions.</p>
	Nicolas Bright	Web	<p>I do not support PSE raising our rates unless they are going full renewables - no coal or gas</p> <p>Nick</p>

**Total Comments:** 495**In Favor:** 7**Opposed:** 432**Undecided:** 56

Filing Support	Commenter	Source	Comments
	William Dearinger	Web	<p>I say NO because the decrease needs to be much more for all the years of overcharging gas customers. I have been living at the above address for 46 years. i have used natural gas for 46 years. It was much better before PSE bought out Washington Natural Gas. The price has never gone down because they jack tou around every month. They have this wonderful thing called BTU FACTOR. They read the meter and then multiply it by the BTU factor which varies from 110% to 116%. It is never zero. If you call them, they cannot tell you how their formula translates to the actual cost of natural gas on the commodities market. As you know, the price of natural gas has been depressed for a long time but our cost keeps escalating. The 4.2% reduction is a joke. Their BTU factor can fluctuate that much between monthly bills. The BTU factor this past month is 110.4881. My cost per therm last month was \$1.47 because of the way they separate their charges. Another rub is the way they jack around my automatic monthly payment plan. Every fall, they lower my monthly payment because during the summer I use less gas. Every spring they raise it because they set it too low in the fall and this past month they want it to be a zero balance so they changed it again. I do not have this problem with my Snohomish county PUD bill.</p> <p>Thank you for your time.</p> <p>Bill Dearinger</p>
	F Aglow	Web	<p>To the Washington state Utilities and Transportation Commission,</p> <p>I am writing to you UTC commissioners to advocate for PSE to pay off and close the remaining 2 coal-fired units in Colstrip, Montana, by the year 2025.</p> <p>Not only am I a citizen concerned about the utility's choice of energy sources, i.e. coal, I am also a ratepayer and customer of PSE—so I expect PSE to be doing its bit to support its climate</p>

			<p>commitments. I do not want to be supporting PSE’s dirty Colstrip coal plant—the third largest climate polluter in the United States.</p> <p>By contrast, I am happy to see such commitments away from coal to renewable, clean energy from our county, King County, and from such companies as Microsoft, Starbucks, Target, and REI. In turn, I believe PSE should be doing its part as a regional utility—leading the charge in upholding energy alternatives that better the world rather than risking the health, lives and livelihoods of our neighbors and our children.</p> <p>Taking such steps—whether you are a utility, an institution, or an individual citizen -- means doing your part as a civic leader.</p> <p>When we look at the devastation wrought by Hurricane Harvey—a hurricane made more dangerous and deadly because of the warmer sea waters partly caused by climate change, we are immediately appalled and chastened. Harvey is just one more symptom of the manmade climate risks we are causing, that are adding to hot summers, hotter and more intense wildfires, higher rainfall and flood events, and sea level rise.</p> <p>All this has to stop. As a society we have to do everything we can to prevent more disastrous Hurricane Harveys. As citizens, companies, and public officials, we need to change the course of our energy choices. That calls for decisive action and creative leadership.</p> <p>As our utilities leaders, please guarantee that PSE be divested from Colstrip coal by 2025—for the health and safety of our cities and towns, our children and our future. Thanks for doing what you can in this regard, to push for bold, decisive leadership in combating climate change.</p> <p>Sincerely, F. Aglow</p>
	<p>Gary Butterfiled</p>	<p>Web</p>	<p>EV-</p> <p>I cannot afford the increase. I feel like the residents of Washington have a good source of hydroelectric plants. Why are receiving yet another rate increase? I just want to pay a reasonable price for electricity. It is baffling to me that we are getting this increase.</p>

**Total Comments:** 495**In Favor:** 7**Opposed:** 432**Undecided:** 56

Filing Support	Commenter	Source	Comments
	Tim Hoffsommer	Web	
	Michael Docker	Web	<p>UE-170034 (electric service)</p> <p>Is there no end to what the UTC will give to a company that is no longer publicly traded is an LLC and predominantly supports Canadian interests. Just keep bleeding the people because this company cant manage it's business. My level of tolerance has a limit. Being bent over and pumped full of glue is not fun for me. Health care up, utility across the board up, insurance up, property tax up, sales tax up. Wages same. The reasons for rate adjustments are lame at best. Resembles poor management and planning. What are the top administrators getting these days and what the kick backs behind closed doors the UTC peeps are getting?</p> <p>UPDATE:  July 20, 2017 - The consumer filed an additional comment.  CommentsI recently received a letter in the mail from the UATC case number 170033. This letter was to inform me of an opportunity to take a full day off work, with no pay. To come and make a comment during a public hearing. Where everyone on the other side of the table will be getting paid for their time. Its insulting to have Washington state employees, whose wages I provide for. Get in bed with the private utility (PSE etc.)and represent everyone but the people. I'm tired of being bent over and pumped full of glue. There are some in this state that enjoy that sort of thing but not me. It wamps being at the mercy of self centered, self serving people.  I recently received a letter in the mail from the UATC case number 170033. This letter was to inform me of an opportunity to take a full day off work, with no pay. To come and make a comment during a public hearing. Where everyone on the other side of the table will be getting paid for their time. Its insulting to have Washington state employees, whose wages I provide for. Get in bed with the private utility (PSE etc.)and represent everyone but the people. I'm tired of being bent over and pumped full of glue. There are some in this state that enjoy that sort of thing but not me. It wamps being at the mercy of self centered, self serving people.</p>

**Total Comments:** 495**In Favor:** 7**Opposed:** 432**Undecided:** 56

Filing Support	Commenter	Source	Comments
	Angela Kulp	Web	I am not in favor of a rate hike. We all have a responsibility to the planet and the human species to use renewable energy and keep fossil fuels in the ground. PSE has a responsibility make new jobs available to Colstrip MT for taking away their coal jobs and destroying their economy.
	Alnoor Virji	Web	Company is asking for another rate hike---this is a yearly pattern for them.Service,esp during winter blackouts remains poor,with loss of power for >2-3 days at a time.No real improvements made. Asking for electricity rate increase so they can pay for the dam takedown and estimated damages from that....WHY are consumers having to bank roll their problem and their bank account....they should be digging deep into their own funds to pay for this.
	John Joseph Pajor	Web	Not only am I a proponent of coal the fact remains of the upcoming economic downturn it will be the most affordable means of energy. I come from an area where natural gas is ubiquitous and numerous where due to aging equipment of there have been explosions as well as health related problems. I think these are sufficient reasons to maintain the Colstrip project. EV-
	Keith Stutler	Web	PSE should make every effort to close the dirty coal-burning power plant in Colstrip, MT, as soon as possible. Coal is a dirty source of climate-change causing pollution, and the Colstrip plant is one of the worst in the country.
	Ruth Frederick	Web	I'm not in favor of it (PSE's proposal) the reason being we have not received a cost of living increase in several years. I can't afford it. My bills are high enough already.
	Terry Hehemann	Web	Do not raise my rates in order to fund your fossil fuel infrastructure. WA is always a leader in doing what's right. Get on board. This can not wait. Thank you.

**Total Comments:** 495**In Favor:** 7**Opposed:** 432**Undecided:** 56

Filing Support	Commenter	Source	Comments
	Kanasia Wavra	Web	7/3/17  I am a Senior citizen on Social Security, which means I am on a budget and I am having a hard time, which means an increase in the rates with PSE will only make it harder for me to make ends meet. Please do not allow the increase, consider the seniors who can not afford yet another increase in rates and makes all have to struggle.

**Total Comments:** 495**In Favor:** 7**Opposed:** 432**Undecided:** 56

Filing Support	Commenter	Source	Comments
	Judy Ferguson	Web	<p>WUTC Commissioners -</p> <p>I urge you to deny Puget Sound Energy's proposed rate changes. In the very recent past, Puget Sound Energy has not shown good stewardship to their customers or the communities in which they live. They are a company looking to make a profit for their shareholders at the expense of the people that they serve, while they fail to maintain their electric and gas line infrastructure or pay for the damages that they cause. The Greenwood explosion, the 161 leaking meters in the Tehaleh development and the electrocution of a young woman tubing down the Puyallup river are some recent examples in the news.</p> <p>I live in close proximity to the Tacoma LNG plant. Puget Sound Energy has been less than forthright about both the ultimate use of the site, as well as the potential hazards it poses. Further, they have never operated a similar operation of the proposed LNG plant's magnitude. To say that many of their responses to citizens concerns and questions have been greenwashed is putting it mildly. The chemical plant explosions in Crosby, Texas are a mirror example of a hazard the Tacoma LNG plant could face in the event of a power outage due to a natural disaster. As the Macquarie Group is apparently looking to sell their Puget Sound Energy shares (40+%), it would seem that once again Tacoma citizens will be left with a ecological mess to have to clean up. Puget Sound Energy has received more than their share of tax credits and Port lease options. It's time to say 'No' to Puget Sound Energy and have them participate in sharing the financial burden that they have placed on their customers in order to be profitable. It's my belief that many Puget Sound Energy customers have no idea that the company was sold to foreign investors. They still believe it's the same old Puget Sound Power &amp; Light and Washington Energy Group folks that looked out for the best interests of Puget Sound families. The current Puget Sound Energy entity is considered believable because citizens don't realize that the ownership has changed. Watching the brazen and untruthful behavior of Puget Sound Energy employees as they've touted the LNG plant has been more than disheartening as a potential environmental disaster in a heavily populated area is in the making. Enough is enough. Thank you for your consideration of my comments.</p>

**Total Comments:** 495**In Favor:** 7**Opposed:** 432**Undecided:** 56

Filing Support	Commenter	Source	Comments
	Nora M	Web	I see that they have already increased their rates from last year. How often do we have to keep going through this? Last year my billing shows an average daily cost of .51 but this year is .67. I do not get a regular hourly pay increase to cover all these costs and I am getting tired of being nickel and dimed to death. Why not come up with a solution to where businesses and residents who are using the top 25% usage get the highest rates. I try to conserve and it seems like I do not get any advantage. This happens with water usage, gas, etc. Why don't the people who overuse the product pay the most? I wish you would stop passing all these costs down to the people who conserve the most. Much like everything else: the people who work the hardest and make a "middle class" income seem to have to pay for all the rich and very poor (or people who are unwilling to work, illegals, etc.) I am getting so tired of this, I might just decide to stop my service. Thank you for your time.
	Katherine Deiter Simpson	Web	Phone (SC) They promised to put the wires underground more than 30 years ago. This has not been done. It hasn't even been started. They should not have a basic rate charge so high. They should pay the cost of printing a bill themselves, that is a ripoff. If they want to add more green power than the hourly charge would be acceptable, but only if there is more green power. We should not foot the bill for natural gas reductions.

**Total Comments:** 495**In Favor:** 7**Opposed:** 432**Undecided:** 56

Filing Support	Commenter	Source	Comments
Undecided			
	David Turner	Web	<p>General Comments</p> <p>Solar Choice Program: PSE should be constrained from using solar farms that have replaced either farmland, open land, wild lands or forest. These options are environmentally destructive. They should be required to use land that is either reclaimed industrial, parking lot cover, roof top, land fill or other areas that do not impact the environment further than it already is. It appears that the Grandview Solar Farm has replaced farmland and should be considered off limits for PSE renewable power even though the Idaho PUC approved it.</p> <p>PSE should be required to subsidize rooftop solar installations wherever it is reasonable. That includes residential and commercial. PSE should also be required to develop and install energy storage from excess daytime generation to offset nighttime usage.</p> <p>The solution to renewable solar energy is not removing more land from the environment but in using spaces that already have been removed for other reasons. I encourage you to develop rules and guidelines that enforce environmental friendly solar installations. Solar is a key to reducing our dependence on non-renewable energy sources. Let's be a leader in using solar wisely.</p>
	Jane Doe	Phone	<p>***VOICEMAIL LEFT MONDAY JULY 4, 9:10 AM. No name or contact information was provided***</p> <p>PSE, bought by England in 2008 or 09 through a company in Australia. England will be raising out rates. Reports say the company will be putting boxes on houses to regulate energy use.</p>

**Total Comments:** 495

**In Favor:** 7

**Opposed:** 432

**Undecided:** 56

Filing Support	Commenter	Source	Comments
	Cass&Johnjoseph Peters-Pajor	E-mail	<p>Viewing your notice of requested changes of PSE rates and public hearings, IU refer to the bullets headed PSE requests rate adjustments for the following reasons: Listing bullets top to bottom A-B-C-D-E and separating B increased decommissioning as 1. and environmental remediation as 2. regarding expenses related to the partial shutdown of the Montana Colstrip Generating Station by July 2022</p> <p>Isn't C, (Increased expenses due to depreciation and cost recover of our capital assets such as electric poles, conduits and transformers) an included item in B1?</p> <p>Proposing to begin collecting now for the this item as detailed in B1. isn't this move considerably premature? What is the formula for this item and what measures are proposed to be in place to prohibit unnecessary inflation or cost stuffing, if this was to be approved?</p> <p>Concerning D (Compliance with the State of WA Clean Air Rule and increased costs for emission reduction requirements are expected to result in higher power costs) what's the date of reimbursement for over-inflated expectations? Does the proposal have a rider for this? Also noting the Clean Air Rule and emissions reduction requirements, how much over Federal Requirements and guidelines is there here? There should be a non-partisan publication of the cost differential for consumer consumption and review considerably before anything should go into effect.</p>

**Total Comments:** 495**In Favor:** 7**Opposed:** 432**Undecided:** 56

Filing Support	Commenter	Source	Comments
	Greg Lipton	E-mail	<p>Puget Sound Energy would like rate payers to pay a fee for renewable electricity. I will be doing this. However, given the Federal cutback in support of renewable energy it seems only logical for the State of Washington to set up a non-profit organization to receive the funds and pass them on to PSE. The non-profit would save those who contribute a few dollars on their Federal income tax. The tax deductible contribution may also increase participation in the program.</p> <p>Sincerely</p> <p>Greg Lipton Mercer Island, WA</p>
	Court Olson	Mail	<p>*** See attached letter for customer comment*** *** 7/31 Public Comment Hearing***</p>
	Sunny Thompson	In person	***Customer attended 8-31-17 public comment hearing***
	Anthony Winkler	In person	***Customer attended 8-31-17 public comment hearing***
	Angela Rush	In person	***Customer attended 8-31-17 public comment hearing***
	Donna Dotrer	In person	***Customer attended 8-31-17 public comment hearing***
	Chris-John Lindsay	In person	***Customer attended 8-31-17 public comment hearing***
	Bill Fishburn	In person	***Customer attended 8-31-17 public comment hearing***
	John Pollewnar	In person	***Customer attended 8-31-17 public comment hearing***
	Pam Turner	In person	***Customer attended 8-31-17 public comment hearing***
	Patty Schacht	In person	***Customer attended 8-31-17 public comment hearing***
	Chris Peterson	In person	***Customer attended 8-31-17 public comment hearing***

**Total Comments:** 495**In Favor:** 7**Opposed:** 432**Undecided:** 56

Filing Support	Commenter	Source	Comments
	Judith C. Peterson	In person	***Customer attended 8-31-17 public comment hearing***
	James Woods	In person	***Customer attended 8-31-17 public comment hearing***
	Joseph Puchot	In person	***Customer attended 8-31-17 public comment hearing***
	Charlie Stephens	In person	***Customer attended 8-31-17 public comment hearing***
	Velma Goodwin	In person	
	Noah Roselander	In person	***Customer attended 8-31-17 public comment hearing***
	Aldey Rusley	In person	***Customer attended 8-31-17 public comment hearing***
	Sean Stuart	In person	***Customer attended 8-31-17 public comment hearing***
	Marlene Meyer	In person	***Customer attended 8-31-17 public comment hearing***
	Winfred Danke	In person	***Customer attended 8-31-17 public comment hearing***
	Averi Azar	In person	***Customer attended 8-31-17 public comment hearing***
	Carolyn Cox	In person	***Customer attended 8-31-17 public comment hearing***
	Arlene Day	In person	***Customer attended 8-31-17 public comment hearing***
	Marilyn Gregson	In person	***Customer attended 8-31-17 public comment hearing***
	Sharon Herting	In person	***Customer attended 8-31-17 public comment hearing***
	Pat Wald	In person	***Customer attended 8-31-17 public comment hearing***
	Kevin Trenberth	In person	***Customer attended 8-31-17 public comment hearing***
	Martha Work	In person	***Customer attended 8-31-17 public comment hearing***
	Mark Tips	In person	***Customer attended 8-31-17 public comment hearing***
	Ann Smith	In person	***Customer attended 8-31-17 public comment hearing***
	Shery Walton	In person	***Customer attended 8-31-17 public comment hearing***

**Total Comments:** 495**In Favor:** 7**Opposed:** 432**Undecided:** 56

Filing Support	Commenter	Source	Comments
	Raging Grannies	In person	***Customer attended the 7-31-17 Public Comment Hearing***
	Bart Arenson	In person	*** Customer attended the 7-31-17 Public Comment Hearing***
	Ruth Lipscomb	In person	*** Customer attended the 7-31-17 Public Comment Hearing***
	Arthur Olson Jr.	In person	*** Customer attended the 7-31-17 Public Comment Hearing***
	Karen Hall	In person	***Customer attended the 7-31-17 Public Comment Hearing***
	Willard Westre	In person	***Customer attended the 7-31-17 Public Comment Hearing***
	Barbara Brain	In person	***Customer attended the 7-31-17 Public Comment Hearing***
	Curt Allred		***Customer attended the 7-31-17 Public Comment Hearing***
	Stephanie Lecovin - Citizens Climate Lobby	In person	***Customer attended the 7-31-17 Public Comment Hearing***
	Gary Smith	In person	***Customer attended the 7-31-17 Public Comment Hearing***
	Jennifer Webscher	In person	***Customer Attended the 7-31-17 Public Comment Hearing***
	Millie Magner	In person	***Customer attended the 7-31-17 Public Comment Hearing***
	Vicki Grayland	In person	***Customer attended the 7-31-17 Public Comment Hearing***
	Karen and Sam Esayian	In person	***Customer attended the 7-31-17 Public Comment Hearing***
	Gail Duncan	In person	***Customer attended the 7-31-17 Public Comment Hearing***
	Tracy Barrett	In person	***Customer attended the 7-31-17 Public Comment Hearing***
	Angela Werr	In person	***Customer attended the 7-31-17 Public Comment Hearing***

**Total Comments:** 495**In Favor:** 7**Opposed:** 432**Undecided:** 56

Filing Support	Commenter	Source	Comments
	Janis Medley - CENSE	In person	***Customer attended the 7-31-17 Public Comment Hearing***
	Mark Glaser	Web	I would like to comment about the basic rate charge. It appears to jump from \$7.87 to \$9.00 for this expected increase. I looked up past increases of the basic rate hike and sometimes it does not increase and other times, like this one, a large percentage increase. It seems the basic change should change very slowly and steadily increase instead of large jumps. Can I get an explanation of why the basic charge increases erratically?
	Shannon Ashurst	Web	Puget Sound Energy (PSE) is requesting a rate increase for its customers. However, I've just read in the Seattle Times that the Washington Utilities and Transportation Commission has instead recommended that PSE reduce rates. More needs to be done to substantiate the need for (and amount of) the proposed rate increase.
Yes			
	Dr. Mark D. Johnson	E-mail	Just got a note on the proposed rate change for PSE in Dec 2017. It looks good to me. Fair and somewhat okay environmentally. I would like to see what a fully 100% renewable energy plan would look like, however.  Dr. Mark D. Johnson 2297 Lummi Shore Rd Bellingham, WA 98226
	Kathryn Vinson	Web	Phone (SC)  I appreciate the fact that electrical service is being upgraded and the environment remediation is being addressed. I am pleasantly surprised. I am in favor of the natural gas decrease. I appreciate that it is fair and reasonable that the price is reflecting the actual cost.

**Total Comments:** 495

**In Favor:** 7

**Opposed:** 432

**Undecided:** 56

Filing Support	Commenter	Source	Comments
	Doug Burger	Web	<p>Dear Friends:</p> <p>I am writing to express my strong support for PSE's proposed electricity rate increase to decommission units 1 and 2 of the Colstrip coal plant by 2022.</p> <p>Additionally, I urge the commission to recommend the decommissioning of units 3 and 4 of Colstrip on an accelerated schedule, by 2025 rather than 2035 (my understanding is that 2035 is the current target).</p> <p>Reducing carbon pollution is an urgent requirement for mitigating the large-scale climate changes that are accelerating quickly. Like California and the nine states participating in RGGI, Washington should be a leader in the clean energy revolution. While I am delighted by the green energy programs PSE offers, and participate in all of them personally (Green Choice, Solar Choice, and nat. gas carbon offsets), the Colstrip plant is the third largest carbon polluter in the United States. Earlier retirement will help to move the economics toward cleaner energy, and will reduce the risks associated with climate change.</p> <p>I would be delighted to comment further if you wish to contact me directly. Thanks for your consideration and best wishes.</p> <p>Sincerely,</p> <p>Doug Burger Distinguished Engineer, Microsoft Corp. Bellevue, WA</p>

**Total Comments:** 495**In Favor:** 7**Opposed:** 432**Undecided:** 56

Filing Support	Commenter	Source	Comments
	Theresa Christiansen	Web	<p>Comment via telephone.</p> <p>Thank you for communicating with the customers.</p>
	Dianna Torrico	Web	<p>PHONE (SH)</p> <p>A rate increase is acceptable but a 2.5% increase is too high. My social security cost of living increase was only 1/2 of 1%. So the 2.5 proposed increase is too high. There have been a lot of new homes in this area connecting to PSE so that should help increase the revenue.</p>
	Rosemary Eldred	Web	I would be very pleased with a gut in her gas bill rates at this point in her life.
	Ty Haveman	Web	<p>I am a customer of Puget Sound Energy. Please approve their request for increasing their electric rates, but do not approve the reduction of natural gas rates. The State should encourage (1) customers to move off fossil fuels by increasing their price, and (2) customers to conserve energy. Increasing rates is one way to do this.</p> <p>In fact, I would highly encourage the introduction of time-of-use (TOU) rates for electric customers in Washington as a way of promoting energy conservation.</p> <p>Again, DO NOT decrease the price of Natural Gas, and DO increase the price of electricity. Preferably, increase it more than the 2.5% requested. I'd like to see it closer to 20 cents per kWh at this time.</p> <p>Thanks!</p>